The New Discoverer DISCOVER'D.

By way of Answer to Mr. BAXTER his Pretended *Discovery* of the GROTIAN RELIGION, With the Several Subjects therein Conteined.

To which is added

AN APPENDIX

Conteining a *Rejoynder* to diverse Things both in the *Key for Catholicks*, and in The book of *Disputations about Church-Government and worship, &c.*

TOGETHER WITH

A Letter to the Learned and Reverend Dr. *Heylin*, Concerning Mr. *Hickman* and Mr. *Bagshaw*.

By THOMAS PIERCE Rector *of* Brington.

Μεγάλη βλάβη τῷ ἀδικοῦντι ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀδικία. *Arrian. Ep. l.4.c.5.*
Their own Tongues shall make them fall. Psal. 64. 8.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. G.* for *Richard Royston* at the Angel in *Ivye-lane.* 1659.

A Preadvertisement to the Reader.

CHRISTIAN READER,

IF thou desirest to know the Reason, why I *begin* to Mr. *Baxter* with *more respect* than thou *allow'st* him; whereas I treat him in my *Appendix* with little more than he *deserves*, (making *almost* as great a *difference* in *my* stile to *him*, as is observable in *his* to *me*,) be pleased to accept of this hasty, but just accompt.

I was indulgent, in the *beginning*, to mine own particular *Inclinations*; but at the *end* I consulted his greatest *Needs*. My *Inclinations* would ever lead me to speak as * *pleasingly* as I may, but that my *Judgment* sometimes *corrects* them, and makes them give way to my * *Neighbour's profit*. His bitter *Enmity* against my *person*, which he hath sturdily *concluded* in a *state of Damnation*, and so by consequence a *Reprobate*, alter *his* way of reasoning, (though, blessed be God, his *Conclusion* is not deduced from any *premises*, save what his *Passion* and his *Fancy* have shap d out to him,) I say his *Enmity* to my *person*, did onely move me to *forgive*, and to use him *gently*. But when I beheld him a second time, as the bitterest *Adversary of Truth*, reviling the *Fathers* of the *Church*, and the *Church herself*,

* πρὸς πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν, πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. *Rom.* 15. 2.

more than *any Presbyterian* I ever met with, (unless I except Mr. *Hickman*, with whom I shall reckon in due time for his *great uncleanneſſe*,) I durſt not * *ſeek to pleaſe men*, ſo as to ceaſe to be *the ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt*. And therefore however I have *begun* my enſuing papers with what was moſt *pleaſant* for *me* to *write*, yet have I ſuffer'd my ſelf *at laſt* to adde ſuch things in the *Concluſion*, as I found Mr. *Baxter* had need to *read*. For if, after my having been very *liberal*, I find my Client ſo much the *worſe*; the likelieſt method to make him *better*, is to become for the future but ſtrictly *juſt*. He is a *different man* in his *book of Government and Worſhip*, and in the later part of his *Key for Catholicks*, from what he was in his *Diſcovery of the Grotian Religion*, (for ſo it ſeems he was pleas'd to *word* it) and that did make him the fitter for ſomewhat a *different Entertainment*. † It is not long ſince he made profeſſion, that *if any ſhould gather* from his Diſcourſe, *my being ſuch my ſelf as he affirmed Grotius to have been, he proteſted againſt all ſuch Accuſations as no part of his intention* : but in his two laſt Volumes his *mind* is *changed*, (or elſe his Members have prevailed *againſt* his mind) ſo far forth as to *accuſe* me of downright *Popery*, and of having a hand in the *Grotian plot*, which (if we may prudently believe him) is *to bring Popery into the Land*, and together with that a *Perſecution*. He takes it ill that I am ſuffer'd to have a ** *Rectory here in England*; and thereupon bewrayes his *judgment*, that I am fitter for the ** *Strappado* : which whilſt he ſaith that ſuch as he *cannot eſcape in my Church*, (implying *me* to be one of the *bloodieſt Papiſts*, (whether

* *Gal.* 1. 10.

† *Grot. Rel. Priſ. Sect.* 3.

** *Key for Cath. p.* 385, 386.

Spaniſh

Spanish or *Italian*, he doth not say) he doth abundantly insinuate his *kindnesse* to me

Had I a heart to return him *Evil for Evil*, I might fitly proclaim him either a *Jesuite*, or a *Jew*. For without question he is *either*, as much as I am a *Papist*: but I will not *vie slanders* with men of *Young*, nor *try* the strength of my *Invention* to beat an *Enemy* at his own *weapon*; for this were onely to be at *strife*, who should be the *most impious*. No, let the *Rigid Presbyterian* take such *victories* to *himself*, without receiving the trouble of being *contended with at all*. I may often times *punish*, but never *wrong* him: and when I punish the *Malefactor*, I spare the *Man*. * Vengeance is a thing which I leave to *God*, I being fully content with a Vindication. 'Tis true I prove him to be a † *Papist* by *fourteen Arguments*; but they are Arguments onely *ad Hominem*, and professedly urged by a *Prosopopœia*, and onely in order to his Conviction, that more may be said against *him*, than *he* can say against *Grotius*; and that his *injuries* to *Grotius* do onely prove his own *hurts*. And having thus proved him to be a *Papist*, I freely * professe to believe him *none*.

* Δῆ τοὺς ἐκείνου ἡμετέρους ἀνθίστασθαι, μήτε τῷ ἀλογίστῳ ἐκείνου δυσμενείᾳ ἀμυνόμενον, μήτε τῷ ἐπιπλέον τούτων ἐυμβήναι ἀμειβόμενον. *Agapet. Diac. ἐκθεσ. κεφαλ. Πολιτικ. p.* 83.

† *See Append. Sect.* 5.

* *Ibid. p.* 175.

I hope his Calumnies of *Grotius*, and the *Episcopal Divines*, will now obtaine the less credit with his most credulous Admirers, for that he hath poured out *the same* (and a great deal *worse*) against a person of great remarke amongst *the Counsellours of State*. * The *Vani* or *Vanists* (for he is pleas'd to speak

* Compare *The Vindication of Sir Henry Vane*, with Mr. Baxter's unchristian usage of him in his *Key for Catholicks*.

speak in both Dialects) are made the burden of his invective in his *Key for Catholicks*. In his Dedicatory Epistle, (which some have call'd his *Court-Flattery*,) he make's a grievous complaint against *ten sorts of men*, of whom he declare's he is very *jealous*. [The third of *these are the Vani, whom God by wonders confounded in new England, but have here prevailed far in the dark.*] To explain his meaning in the *Epistle*, he tell's us † plainly in the *Book*, that the first sort of *Jugglers*, or *Hiders* of their Religion, *under whom the Papists do now manage their principal design*, are the *Vani*, *whose Game was first plaid openly in* America *in* New-England, *where God gave his Testimonies against them from heaven upon their two Prophetesses*, Mrs. *Hutchinson and* Mrs. *Dyer*; *the later brought forth a Monster with the parts of Bird, Beast, Fish, and Man. The former brought forth many* (*neer* 30.) *Monstrous Births at once, and was after slain by the* Indians. *This providence* (he add's) *should have awakened the Parliament to a wise and godly jealousie of the Counsells and Designs of him that was in* New-England, *the Master of the Game, and to have carefully searched how much of his Doctrine and design were from heaven, and how much of them he brought with him from* Italy, *or at least was begotten by the Progenitor of Monsters.* And lest his Readers should be to seek on *whom* he fasten's such ugly calumnies, he frequently * nameth Sir *Henry Vane*, neither regarding the *Quality*, or *Learned parts* of that *Knight*, nor any the least *Reverence* or *Care* of *Truth*.

† *Key for Cath. p.* 330, 331.

* *Ibid. p.* 319, 329, 338.

Of this, and many the like prancks, I am particularly concern'd to take some notice, first because Mr.

Mr. *Baxter* hath coupled † the *Vani* with Mr. *P.* And both with four sorts of men, by whom the *Popish design is kept on foot*; to wit the *Seekers*, the *Infidels*, the *Behmenists*, and the *Quakers*. Next because mine *own* sufferings have taught me to look with indignation on *other Men's*, how little soever *their* principles agree with *mine*. And though I suppose Sir *Henry Vane* is very far from being partiall to the *Episcopal Divines*, (with whom I will rather choose to suffer the greatest *hardships*, than embrace the * *Friendship of the world*, † *or enjoy the pleasures of Sin for a season*,) yet are we bound to do him *right*, and to be sensible of his *wrongs*, and to afford him that deference, which both his *Birth* and his *Breeding* have made his *due*. When St *Paul* had to do with a *person* of *honour* amongst the *Heathen*, he was so *civil* as to call him *most noble Festus*. And he is sure a *grosse Christian*, who think's it his duty to be a *Clown*. I cannot tell what judgement that Learned Gentleman may be of; but he hath this commendation (as well as *Grotius*) *that he is hated by* Mr. *Baxter beyond all measure*, and is sufficiently *averse to the Presbyterians*.

† *Ibid. p.* 391.

* *Jam.* 4. 4.
† *Heb.* 11. 25.

κράτιστε φῶστα. *Acts* 26. 25.

Christian Reader, have the patience to be *preadmonish'd* of one thing more. The *greatest* abuse and the most *groundlesse* which I have suffer'd from Mr. *Baxter* (in no less than three distinct Volumes) is his indeavour to represent me, as an *Enemy to Purity and pious life*. Which however he hath done in as *grosse* a manner, as if he had tryed to what *Extremities* both of *absurdity* and *Falshood*, depraved Man may be transported by abusing the *Liber-*

ty

ty of his *Will*, (which God could never *predetermine* to such *uncleannesse*,) yet *some* at least of his *Followers* who have never yet *seen* him without his *Vizard*, have been betrayed by that *confidence* (with which he hath written *against his Conscience*) to incourage his *calumnies* with their *belief*. As for *reason*, or *proof*, he hath not *offer'd* any thing towards it, but to supply that defect, he hath thought it enough to *declaim* against me, for being *supposed* to have *declaim'd* against *Puritanes*, neither naming *any one passage* in any papers which I had publish'd, nor so much as *referring to any page* where any such *passage* was to be *found*. I received letters of inquiry, [*where* I had written against *Puritanes*, that Mr. *Baxter* should so *largely* rebuke me for it before the world? My answer was, that *I never did it*, for ought I was able to *remember*; and that untill Mr. *Baxter* could shew me *where*, I should not believe I had been *forgetfull*. Indeed I * cited that part of *King James* his *Letter*, which told the Bishops *they had to do with two sorts of Enemies, Papists and Puritanes, and will'd them to goe forward against the one and the other*. But it appeare's by these words, not that I, or Archbishop *Spotswood*, (by whom the Letter is recorded) but that *King James, who writ the Letter, had sharply written against Puritanes*. In so much that Mr. *Baxter* hath dealt with *me*, as he hath also dealt with Sir *Henry Vane*, whom he † supposeth to have brought *Corrupt Opinions out of* Italy, when it appeare's that Sir *Henry* was *never there*.

* Bauldrl. ch. 3. p. 75.

† Kryser Cath. p. 331.

But now *admit* that I had written against the Puritanes, before his clamour was put in print, (as very

very possibly I did, though I professe I know not *where*, and much desire to be inform'd) yet I had done no other thing, than had been donby the most eminent in point of *Piety*, *Learning*, *Judgment* and *Moderation*, from the dayes of Queen *Elizabeth*, to these our *own*. And if *I* am an *Enemy to Religion* for having cited the words of *others*, what will be said by Mr. *Baxter* of Archbishop *Whitgift*, Archbishop *Bancroft*, Judicious *Hooker*, Judge *Popham*, Bishop *Andrews*, Bishop *Carleton*, Bishop *Hall*, Dr. *Sanderson*, (with divers others, whom I have cited in the *first Chapter* of this Book) whose just severity to the *Puritanes* may serve to put Mr. *Baxter* to *shame* and *silence*.

If he means no more than *this*, that I have cited out of the Writings of *English* and *Scotish Presbyterians*, their *own* * *Confessions* of their *own principles* and *practise* too, he should have honestly told his Readers, that I had written no worse of the *Presbyterians*, than *themselves* had written of *themselves*. Nor should he have called *them Puritanes*, whom I had called *Presbyterians*, (as themselves in their Writings have call'd themselves) unless he was willing to acknowledge that they were *both* the *same thing*. Observe (good Reader) how the Case stands between us. It is *confessed* by Mr. *Knox*, that *James Melvin* (with two more) did privately *murder* the *Archbp.* of St. *Andrews*, which the same Mr. *Knox* doth withall *commend* for a *Godly Fact*. This *Confession* I † observed, and shewed his *page* where it is *printed*. Again by 52. *Ministers of the Province of London* it was *confessed* (from the *presse* too) that *in stead of a Reformation they had a Deformation in Religion*,

* ☞ See *The Sel. Revenger exemplified ch. 3. p. 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, &c.*

† *Ibid. p. 82.*

ligion, ----having open'd the very Flood-gates to all Impiety and profanenesse, &c. This *Concession* I[a] observed, and shew'd the *page* where it was printed. *That* proceeded from the *Scotish*, this from the *English* Presbyterians. What may now be the reason, that Mr. *Baxter* pursue's me with so much Rancor? Was it my fault that the things were printed, (without my knowledge or consent) and printed by the Authors from whom I had them? Or may not a man *relate* a passage, as he find's it printed before his eyes? Which was *worst* of the *two*, that Mr. *Knox* the Presbyterian *commended Murder*, or that a man of the *Church* of *England* did fairly *cite* his commendation? Let it be judg'd by my writings, and by the Authors whom I produce, whether I am so like an *Enemy* to *Christian purity*, as they (who say it) are *Friends* and *Fautors* to the most *Heathenish Impurity* to be imagin'd.

[a] Ibid p. 81.

And because I have met with a sort of men, who having been *led* by *blind guides*, have stuck so fast in the *ditch* of *error*, as to believe the word *Puritane* is of a faire signification, and import's a man of a *pious life*, I think it my duty to *declare*, (before I admit them to read my Book) that whensoever I shall be found to speak severely concerning *Puritanes*, (and that in meer satisfaction to Mr. *Baxter*) I mean *no other* then have been meant by Bishop *Andrewes* of blessed Memory, or by the learned and Reverend Dr. *Sanderson*, with other persons of renown hereafter mention'd. *Puritanes* properly are things, which being inwardly full of *Filth*, do either esteem themselves *pure*, or would fain by *others* be so esteemed. And for the very same reason,

son, that Bishop *Andrews* fasten'd the name of *Puritanes* on those old *Hereticks*, the *Catharists*, I may bestow it on the * *Samaritans*, those older *Schismaticks* amongst the Hebrews; who reckon'd others so *impure* in comparison of themselves, that if a man drew *neer* them who was not one of their *Faction*, they would send him away with a [*Ne Attingas*] *touch me not thou man of Sin.* Such like *Puritanes* were *they*, whom *God himself* hath describ'd by the Prophet *Esay* [*A Rebellious people, which walketh in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts: A people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face, that sacrificeth in Gardens, and burneth Incense upon altars of Brick,* .... *which say,* STAND BY THY SELF, COME NOT NEAR TO ME, FOR I AM HOLIER THEN THOU. *Isa.* 65. 2, 3, 5.] Yet as *Godly*, and as *pure*, as in the pride of their hearts they esteemed themselves, God denounceth them as *fewel* to the *unclean Fire of Hell.* For so the Chaldee Paraphrase doth understand the next words. *These shall be a smoak in mine Anger, and a Fire that burneth all the day. Ibid.* Such again were those *Puritanes* (for I may boldly *parachronize* by so great an example as Bishop *Andrews*) of whom we are told by the *Royall Preacher*, [*there is a generation who are pure in their own eyes, and yet are not washed from their filthinesse.* Prov. 30. 12.] These are persons the more *desperate*, and incapable of *cure*, the more difficult it is to make them feel that they are *sick*. Continuing *pure in their own eyes*, we cannot perswade them

* Ipsi Impuri cùm essent alios à se ut impuros arcebant. Sicut *Samaritas Geographus Arabs* clamasse ait, *Ne Attingas.* Ejus *Samaritarum* moris etiam ad hunc locum meminit *Hieronymus. vid. Grot. in Isa.* 65. 5.

* 2 Cor. 7. 1. to * *cleanse themselves from any manner of filthinesse, of flesh, or spirit.* Thence said our Saviour to the *Puritanes*, who thought *too well* of *themselves*, to accept of *him* for their *Physitian*, [*Verily I say unto you that the Publicans and Harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you.* Mat. 21. 31.]

If when I shew my *aversion* to such as these *whom God abhorreth*, and give my instance in Mr. *Knox*, with other *rigid Presbyterians*, (as the *Lord Chancellor Egerton* had done before me) adding the reasons of what I do from *Notoreity* of *Fact*, and commonly too from their own *Confessions*; It (I say) in such case, Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Hickman* conclude themselves to be concern'd, without so much as demanding whether or no I mean *them*, they are *ipso Facto* their *own Accusers*. It is not my fault, that *Hypocrisie* is a *Sin*; nor that I labour to make it *odious*. If men are *conscious* to themselves of being *Hypocrites*, as I am not *able* to make them less conscious, so neither *would* I, if I were able. My publick * professions might have sufficed, that when my *words* are *general*, I aime at *none* in *particular*, unlesse I *name* them. If such as must acknowledge they were *not nam'd*, will needes be *naming themselves in print*, or otherwise make *applications* where I make *none*, they themselves must acknowledge, *I cannot help it.*

* *premonition prefixt to* Eusl. p. ult.

And therefore whatsoever *unchristian speeches*, I may continue to suffer for my *Good will*, from such as (in order to their *gain*) do put on *godlinesse* for a *disguize*, I will not cease (Good Reader) to put thee alwaies in remembrance, that the difference is as wide betwixt *Purity* and *Puritanism*, as betwixt

Holinesse

Holinesse and *Hypocrisie*. Let *Epicharmus* his Apophthegm never depart out of thy mind, Νῆφε, καὶ μὴ πιστεύε. *be sober and distrustfull.* Let the wisdom of the serpent protect the innocency of the dove. A *prudent diffidence* is a lesson which is at least as *needfull*, as it is *difficult* to be learnt. Take that from * *Euripedes*; and this from † *Tully*; that not to be sway'd over hastily by the *outward* * *appearances* of men, is no lesse then *the Sinew and strength of wisdome.* And therefore however it is *natural* for *Gold* to *glister*, yet remember that *Art* is the *Ape* of *Nature*, and that many things do *glister* which are *not Gold.*

* Σώφρονος δ' ἀπιστίας οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν χρησιμώτερον βροτοῖς. *Euripid. in Helenâ.*

† *Nervi & Artus sapientiæ, non temerè credere.* Cicero de petitione Consul.

Before thou seest my *first sheets*, be pleas'd to know that they were *printed*, *before* I saw the *two Volumes* to which I speak in my *Appendix*. If thou thinkst that I have *err'd* in my *civil Expressions* to Mr. *Baxter*, whose *incivilities* towards *me* made him unworthy of such a *treatment*; remember my *errors* are on the *right hand*, whilst *his* are exceedingly on the *left*. And although I have taken a special care, not to be censur'd in his next Volume (like *them* that sent him *kind Letters*) for one of his * *flattering and fawning Adversaries*; yet I conceived it my advantage, to use him *better* then he *deserv'd*. But if thou art not of my opinion, and art so rigid an exactor of *Arithmetical proportion* in every exercise or act of *vindicative justice*, as not to allow *those errors* in me, which thou yieldest to be of the *better sort*; it is but takeing thy Pen and Inke, and putting them *all* in the *Errata*.

* *Mat.* 23. 28.

* Note the barbarous Requital of *Civil usage.*

The

The general Contents of the several Chapters.

The Introduction.

Of *David* and *Peter* in Mr. *Baxter's* Title-page. Of *Puritans* and *Sequestrations* in the same.

CHAP. I.
Concerning Grotius.

SECT. I. His Religion and Design. *Sect.*3. His English Followers. Dr. *Hammond* and Mr. *Thorndike* in his defence. *Sect.*4. To calumniate *Grotius* confessed odious by his Calumniator. *Sect.*5. Mr. *Baxter's* promise of Repentance *ex hypothesi*. *Grotius* accused of turning Papist. But proved none by XIX. Arguments. Drawn from *other men's* Testimonies, and from his *own*. From his own both *private* and *publick* Professions of himself. An Accompt of his Religion from *his Animadversions* upon *Rivet's*. From his *Annals* and *Histories*. His *Notes* on *Cassander*. His *Votum pro Pace*. His *Epistles to the French*. His *De Imperio Sum. Pot. circa Sacra*. His *Discussio* Apologetici Rivetiani. From the last Act of his *Life*, his *Death*, *Burial*. —*Sect.*6. Of his pretended Dissimulation, and how it reflects on his Accuser. *Sect.*7. *Grotius* at last is but a Papist with an *if*, &c. *Sect.*8. Popery disclaimed as well by *Grotius* and Mr. *P.* as by Mr. *Baxter*. *Sect.*9. Mistakes in reading *Grotius*, arisseing from a nescience or hatred of his design. *Sect.*10. How much may be offered to purchase peace. *Sect.*11. *Grotius* his

Doctrine

Doctrine and Design more Catholical than Mr. *Baxter's*. *Sect.*12. And the terms to which he calls us, less impossible. *Sect.*13. *Grotius* doth not cut off the holiest parts of the Church. *Sect.*14. His way is not uncharitable. *Sect.*15. It doth not tend to persecution. *Sect.*16. It doth not engage in a way of Sin. *Sect.*17. Mens thoughts of *Grotius* must be esteemed by their words. *Sect.*18. The Conclusion, conteining a muster of those *Reproaches* which are cast on *Grotius* by Mr. *Baxter*, and what disadvantage doth thence ensue.

CHAP. II.
Concerning Subjects of several Natures.

*Sect.*1. Mr. *Baxter's* acknowledgment of Charity, with his uncharitable Requital. *Sect.*3. The title of *Arminian* unseasonably applied. *Sect.*4. Neither *Grotius* nor any *else* can be too severe against *blasphemy*. *Sect.*5. What differences are *verbal*, and what are *real*. *Sect.*6. A material difference indeed. *Sect.*8. Of heads of Controversy reconcileable. *Sect.*9. *Grotius* made not uncharitable inferences, but recited onely already made.

CHAP. III.
Concerning the State of David *and the Godly, whilst yet Impenitent.*

*Sect.*1. A strange difference between the Godly, and the notoriously ungodly. *Sect.*2. The excessive danger of making the greatest sinners to dream themselves into a Saintship. The danger exemplified in a Presbyterian woman *Sect.*3. The sins of *David* with their Circumstances. *Sect.*4. *Peter's* sins very different from those of *David*. *Sect.*5. Of *Solomon's* state and its uncertainty. *Sect.*6. The *Reprobates* are granted by Mr. *Baxter* to have grace *sufficient*. Mr. *Baxter's* Description of Common Grace and its effects. *Sect.*7. Of men twice sanctified. *Sect.*8. Concerning

ning the importance of *Heb.* 6. & 10. *Sect.* 9. Gods testimony of *David* twofold, each to be compared with the Rule, *Ezek.* 18. 24. &c. *Sect.* 10. How far charity was decayed in *David*; and how hard it is to *murder wilfully in love*. Sect. 11. Of Davids Prayer *Psal.* 51. *Sect.* 12. His being clearly unsanctified by his accumulated sins. Sect. 13. *A signall quick-sand* to be *avoided* by all that are ensnared with the novel notion of perseverance. Sect. 14. Of *Faith* as a *practicall adherence unto God*. Sect. 15. *David* was soberly put to it. *Sect.* 16. The *fallacious* use of the word *Graceless*. Sect. 17. Some are *thinkers* to their own prejudice. *Sect.* 18. It is an other *quick-sand* to be *avoided*, which leads men to think they are the *better* for their *Hypocrisie*. *Sect.* 19. What it *is*, and what it is *not*, to *build upon a rock*. *Sect.* 20. The horror of a Doctrine should teach its vassals to disclaim it. The equivocal refuge of being obedient in the maine. *Sect.* 21. What was predominant in *David* when he deliberately sinned. *Sect.* 22. None in *adultery* and *murder* can be really *good* men *before* the time of their *repentance*. *Sect.* 23. The *danger* of the *great error* proposed to consideration, what desperate Doctrines have been applauded by some of the ablest Presbyterians, no whit better then those of *Wickliff*.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning Subjects of several Natures.

Sect. 1. A tacite and groundless accusation sadly reflecting on the accuser. Sect. 2. Of condemning brethren. The accuser is the most criminal. Sect. 3. Wants of charity examin'd, and found to be in the accuser. Sect. 5. The accusers character of himself. *Sect.* 6. His obligations to recall, if not resolutely mischievous.

CHAP. V.

Concerning Puritanes.

Sect. 1. The Puritanes lives no better then their doctrines. Sect. 3. Their partiality to their own Tribe. The contrary lives of Antipuritanes. Sect. 4. The Accusers concurrence with the *Jesuite*. Sect. 5. *Fitz-Simmons* his Artifice discovered, and the Putitanes serviceablenesse to the Papists. Sect. 6. *King James* his description of a Puritane. Sect. 7. What Puritane signifies with the Papists. Sect. 8. A mistake of the *old Catharists* who yet were *Puritanes* before the word was fitted to the thing. *Grotius* groundlesly calumniated afresh. Sect. 9. What the Puritanes were with the old Episcopal party. The judgement of Archbishop *Whitgift* and *judicious Hooker* concerning Puritanes, Dr. *Sanderson's* judgement of the same. Sect. 10. Bishop *Andrews* his judgement of Puritanes in his Sermon of worshipping imaginations, p. 29. A.D.1592. published by supreme Authority. Sect. 11. Sir John *Harrington's* judgement of Puritanes. The judgement of Queen *Eliz:* and her *Privy Counsel*, and Archbishop *Bancroft* p. 12.13. and Archbishop *Whitgift*. ib. p. 7. 8. Of Judge *Popham*. Sect. 12. The *Lord keeper Puckering's* judgement of Puritanes by the direction of Queen *Eliz:* delivered in the House of Lord in Parliament assembled. Sect. 13. The judgement of Dr. *R. Clarke*, one of the *Translators* of the *Bible*, concerning the *then-Puritanes*, in his second Visitation Sermon *Zech.* 12. 17. Sect. 14. An accompt of Puritanes from the *Examen Historicum*. *Wichliff's new Gospel*. Their helping on the Popish interest. Their rebellious Principles. Sect. 15. Bishop *Montagues* judgement of Puritanes. Sect. 16. *Grotius* his judgement concerning *Puritanes*. Mr. *Thorndike's* judgement of *Puritanes*; Bishop *Hall's* judgement of *Puritanes* in his Latin exhortation to the Synod at *Dort*, on *Eccles.* 7. 16. Sect. 17. King *James* distinguished the

Knaves-

Knaves-Puritane, from the *Puritane-Knave*. Sect. 18. Of the word *Roundhead*, and praying *aloud* in private. Sect. 19. How the *Puritanes* are the worst kind of *swearers*. Sect. 20. The tale of drinking *a bloody health to the Devil*, no less impertinent, then uncharitable. A gross and dangerous falsification in the management of the tale. Men should be taught by their *sufferings* not to do wrong. A *Caveat* against *Raisers* of *false reports*. Confident corrupting of plain words. Sect. 22. How some *Puritanes* have excommunicated themselves. The *Monopolizer* of *Censoriousness* no good *Projecter*. Sect. 23. A strange kind of *Catholick*, who is *against* the *whole Church*, yet partially cleaves unto a *Sect*, whilst he *condemn's* it. Sect. 24. A wilfull imposture, or else a Patronage of impiety.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the Sequestration of Episcopal Divines.

Sect. 1. Of *Episcopal Divines* and the *Archbishop* of *Cant.* Sect. 2. Sequestrations *misliked* by their very *Abettors*. Sect. 3. Sufficient information for such as want and desire it. Guilty men must keep their secrets or not be angry that they are known. Sect. 4. A sad plea for *injustice* from an *opinion* that it is *good* Sect. 5. Sequestrations *disowned* by their *Defender*. Sect. 6. Accusations are of no value, when onely *general*, and *without proof*. An *ill* man may have a *good* title to his Estate, and must not be wrong'd for being *unrighteous*. Evil must not be done in pretence of good ends. *Rom.* 3. 8. Sect. 7. He who craves help must have the patience to receive it. Sect. 8. The shamefulness of Mr. *Whites Centuries*, *worse* were put *into* livings then the *worst* that were put *out*. Sect. 9. Unseasonable *bitterness to the Protestants*, from one who would not befriend the *Papists*. The indefinite *Accuser brought to his triall* by some particulars. A signal Confession, that what is call'd a *Reformation* was but a *change unto the worse*. Presbyterian *confessions* to the advantage of the *Prelatists*. The *National*

Covenant confessed faulty. Sect. 10. A strange way of arguing in the behalf of *Cruelty*. Its consequence subversive of all humane society. Sect. 11. Concerning *Usurpers* and *Restitution*. Sect. 12. What sequestrations are misliked, and what not. Sect. 13. Of growing Lusty on Sequestrations, and *self-denial in usurpation*.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Dort-Synod and the Remonstrants.

Sect. 1. A confessed *ὑστερολογία*. Sect. 2. The Synod is unexcusable by *standing out* after *yielding*. Sect. 3. Of grace which is *really*, not *verbally* sufficient. Sect. 4. *Austin* confessedly against the Synod of *Dort*. Sect. 5. The extent of grace. Sect. 6. The *Synod* of *Dort* parallel'd with the *Jesuites* even by its *own Advocates*. Sect. 7. The Deniall of originall pravity falsely charged on the *Remonstrants*. Sect. 8. How much there is in the *will of man*. Sect. 9. To convert a sinner no breach of charity. Sect. 10. Who it is that abuseth the choisest of Gods servants. Sect. 11. Made appeare by an example.

The

The Contents of the APPENDIX.

Concerning severall Subjects both in *The Key for Catholicks*, and in the Book of *Disputations of Church-Government and Worship*.

SECT. I. The chief occasion of the Appendix Sect. 2. Mr. Baxters charge of *Popery* attended with *self-contradictions*. Sect. 3. Made the more hainous in four respects. Sect. 4. He is shew'd his *Danger*, as well as *guilt*. Sect. 5. Himself proved to be a *Papist* by fourteen Arguments, according to his own Logick. Grotius vindicated and cleared from all appearance of *Popery* (from. Sect. 6. to Sect. 26.) The testimony of *Poelenburg* opposed to that of *Barravius*. Mr. *Baxters* confounding a *Primacy* of *order* with a *supremacy* of *power*. And the *New* Canons of *Rome* with the *ancient* Canons of *General Councils*. His many and grievous mistakes in translating *Grotius* his *Latin*; whether from *wilfulness*, or *weakness*, is referred unto the Reader. *Grotius* his design had no influence on our English changes. No Church-preferment was offer'd to him. *Franciscus à Sanctâ Clarâ* had a contrary design. Dr. *Bezier* cleared from an implicit Calumny. The Popes Primacy allow'd by all sorts of *Protestants* as well as *Grotius*; Bishop *Andrews*, Bishop *Bramhall*, Dr. *Hammond*, &c. A conjecture passed upon the letters which Mr. *Baxter* saith were sent to him of the real presence in the Lords Supper. Material and formal Idolatry. Two sorts of *Papists*. The granted Primacy a Bulwarke against *Popery*; Pacificks are not a cause of discord. The Primacy of the Pope; how it removeth the whole mistake.

Sect. 29. By whom our *Breaches* were first made, and are

are ever since widened. The wrong sore rubb'd by Mr. *Baxter*, and *Presbyterians* gall'd upon the *Prelatists backs*. The Prelatists beaten for being abused yet are earnest desirers of Reconcilement. The *Church of England justified* by the Confessions of her *Deserters*. The Presbyterian *separatists* apparently unexcusable. They are obnoxious to men of all sides for their sin of *schisme*. Especially to the *Episcopal*, whose sufferings have made them the more conformable to the Primitive Christians. Sect. 30. *Lay-Elders* condemn'd by such as had sworn to assert them. Sect. 31. A Calumny cast upon our *Preachers* to the sole disgrace of the Calumniator. *Once* a day *Preaching* and Catechizing, a great deal better then *Praeeing twice*. The Accuser most criminall. The *Presbyterian Readers* are many more then the *Episcopal*. And their Preaching much *worse*, if we may credit their own *confessions*. An agreement in point of *Railing* between the *Quakers* and *Presbyterians*. *Sect.* 32. A fair Confession how far a *Protestant* may go, and be still a *Protestant*.

Sect. 33. *Of Bishops and Presbytery*. Bishop *Hall's* censure of the disturbers of setled Government in the Church. The Lord *Primate's* censure of *Presbyterian Ordinations*, as invalid and *Schismatical*; Dr. *Holdsworth's* sufferings a Declaration of his judgement. *Sect.* 34. The Presbyterian *excuses* are *Aggravations* of their offences. *Sect.* 35. Bishop *Prideaux* confessed a *Moderate* man, though the *sharpest Censor* of our English *Presbyterians*. He doth Characterize them by *Ravenous Wolves*. By ambitious *low shrubs* conspiring against the *goodly Oake*. By a petulant *Ape* on the house top. By the greedy *Dog*, and the *Sacrilegious Bird* in the common Fable. By *Baltasar* and *Achan*. By the title *Smectymnuan*, importing a monster with many heads. By the *Bramble*, consuming the *Cedar* of *Lebanon*. Bishop *Prideaux* us'd worse then any scandalous Minister.

Sect. 36. A vindication of *Bishops*, and Doctor *Hammond's Paraphrase*. *Sect.* 37. A *Refutation* of the prime Argument for *Presbyterian Ordinations*. Mr. *Baxter* proved

ved to be an *Heathen* by his *own Art* of *Syllogizing*. Sect. 38. *Presbyterians* are not *Bishops* by having *Deacons* under them. *Sect.* 39. Immoderate virulence towards those of the Episcopal way. Mr. *Thorndike's* judgement of Presbyterian *Ordinations*.

Sect. 40. A parallel case between the *Pharisees* of old, and our modern *Puritans*.

Sect. 41. What hath been meant by the word *Puritan* by Learned men. The Lord *Chancellor Egerton's* judgement of *Puritans*. Bishop *Bramhall's* judgement of the same. Bishop *Hall* of *Pharisaism* and *Christianity*.

Sect. 42. The Presbyterian *Directory* exceedingly abominable. The Kings reasons against the *Directory*. And his reasons for the *Common Prayer*.

Sect. 43. Concerning *Coppinger* and *Hacket*, and the communication of their *Design* to the *Presbyterian Ministers*. *Sect.* 44. Dr. *Steward's* Sermon at *Paris*. And Dr. *Heylin's Antipuritanism*.

TO

TO

To the Reverend

Mr RICHARD BAXTER.

Reverend Sir,

Sect. 1. AFter so many of my indeavours to disappoint the open enemies of Truth and Reason, thereby to rescue poor *Christians* from the worst kind of *thraldom*, in which too many have been held by the *Mythologie* of the *Turks*, whose desperate *Doctrine* of God's *Decrees* doth seem to me *more terrible* then all their *Armies*, by how much the *bondage* of a man's *Spirit* is more to be *fear'd* then that of his *Flesh*, (for the effecting of which Rescue, I verily thought you had laboured with me, till what you rais'd with *one* hand you also ruin'd with the *other*; which made me think many times of *Penelope's Web*,) I pleas'd my self with an opinion that my Disputes were all ended; and that a liberty would be allowed me to pass the remnant of my dayes in my *proper Element*: I take the words of old *Hesiod* as if they were spoke unto my self, Ὦ πίων, σὺ δ' ταῦτα τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ θυμῷ· Μηδ' ἔρις ναυάγαις ἐν ἔργου θυμὸν ἐρύοις Νείκεα· ἐνναέτεος· For although perhaps I may not say I have as great an *Averseness* to all *Contention*, as that of the *Fish* unto the *Fire*; yet am I not able to *indure* it, but when I steadfastly believe it to be a *Duty*. And being perswaded that it is *mine*, I dare not shrink from

a *discharge*, how much soever it may cost me in *self-denials*. That alone is the time of my being imployed in my *proper Element*, when I am studying the *Doctrine* and *Life* of Christ, as *both* are ordinable to *practice*; when I am preaching the glad tidings of the *Gospel of Peace*, as one to whom is *committed the Word of Reconciliation*; when I am teaching the *Ignorant*, admonishing the *Guilty*, procuring *settlement* to the *Doubtful*, and binding up the *broken-hearted*; when I am anxiously pressing for *Love*, and *Loyaltie*, and *Evangelical obedience* to every one of Christs Precepts, that the profession of Christianity may not be brought into * *disgrace*, nor the *name of Christ be blasphemed among the Gentiles*, through them who call it their *duty* to live in a course of *disobedience*, and even boast that they have learn'd it in *Christs own school*.

2 Cor. 5. 19.

* In nobis Christus patitur opprobriũ, in nobis patitur † Lex Christiana maledictum, æstimari it aque de cultoribus suis potest ille qui colitur. *Salvian de Gubern.* lib. 4. † *Rom.* 2. 24.

Sect. 2. But the *opinion* which I was of, that it would once more be given me to live in *peace*, (I speak of peace from *without*, for mine enemies cannot rob me of peace *within*,) and to imploy my whole time in those more acceptable indeavours, to which the bent of my soul doth most puissantly incline me, although it was *innocent* and *pleasing*, (whilest it was able to stay with me,) yet it appeared upon a sudden to have been a very *fugitive* and *false opinion*. For no sooner had I begun to *beat my sword into a Plow-share*, and to trie if men might be brought into an *unity of Love* (of which the *first-fruits* are since made *publick*) when an *unity of Judgment* appeared to be so unattainable; but straight I found my sels *alarm'd*, and bid to stand upon my *guard*, as being openly *defied* to a fresh *encounter*. So little hope is there of *peace* to one who finally resolves not to have *friendship* with the *world*, (I mean that * *friendship* which is *enmity with God*) that I am not afforded some little *truce*. I have not onely been *assaulted* by a *succession* of *Aggressors*, for some years past, but commonly divers of them *at once* have *fallen* hastily

* Jam. 4. 4.

hastily *upon* me in the very same *quarters*; hoping the *number* of their *men* might *distract* my thoughts, when the *weight* of their *Arguments* could not be able to *oppress* them.

Sect. 3. Of all those persons who have at any time *discharged* their *Pens* upon me, from Doctor *Reynolds* to Mr. *Hickman*, (that is, from the *worthiest* to the *unworthiest* of my Assailants,) none hath ever more exercised either my *joy*, or *sorrow*, or *admiration*, than your very much applauded and reverend self. First, it was matter to me of *joy*, that I should *now* have to do with a *sufficient adversary*; whom (after the reverend Doctor *Reynolds*) I had esteemed one of the *ablest* of all that are *enemies* to the *Church*. Next, it was matter to me of *sorrow*, that so *famous* a Writer as you have been, should call me forth into the *field* in so poor a *Quarrel*, and that you made not choice of a *fitter subject*, which might have made you *lesse liable* then now you are. But I was taken with *admiration*, when I found you calling me *Arminian*, and inveighing against me even as *such*, when you your self (with as much reason) had been written against as an *Arminian*, and that by the men of your own dear party: methinks by your own *unjust sufferings* you might have learnt *compassion* on them that suffer *as unjustly* as you can possibly have done. I wish you had taken more * time to *weigh* the *matter* you were to write of, then you would seem to have taken to *write your book*. I wish it for mine *own* sake as well as *yours*. Because the greater your *failings* are, the less you are capable of *excuses*, for which I should be willing to yield *some place*. And the easier it is to *subdue* your *forces*, I have the less incouragement to *strive* with you at all; and so the less to rejoice in my imployment. But being one of *Christs soldiers*, and warring under his *Banner*, I cannot make mine own *enemy*, or must I chuse mine own *ground* or way of *Castrametation*. I am to fight against *Error* and *Sin* in general; and because I cannot do *all* at *once*, I am

* Optimum emendandi genus est, si scripta in aliquod tempus reponantur, ut ad ea tanquam nova & aliena redeamus, ne nobis tanquam recentes fœtus blandiantur. *Quintil.*

I am bound to *fall on* wheresoever I am appointed by my *commander in chief*, or where mine Adversaries *challenge* hath made it *needful*.

Of David and Peter in the Title page.

Sect. 4. Should I begin with your *Title-page*, and say as much against that, as that hath given me occasion, my *Introduction* would be in danger to be as long as your *Preface*. Which though but almost *half* your Book, yet it seems to me much more then the *whole*; at least in my sense, if not in * *Hesiods*, And the *Portal* being the chiefest part of the *House*, puts me in mind of what was said by *Diodorus* of *Sicily*, † *That there are some Historians who have made their whole story a meer Appendix unto their speeches.* I will not therefore incur the danger of a voluminous *Introduction*, by insisting on the unfitness of every part of your *Title-page*, but onely remove one special *stumbling-block*, which you were pleased to put in your Readers *way*.

* πολὺ ἥμισυ παντὸς. *Hesiod.* l. 1. ἔργ. & ἡμ.

† Ἔνιοι δὲ παραβλάψαντες τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασι. *Diodor. Sicul.* l. 20. p. 746.

In the Title of your book, you pretend a *vindication* of *David* and *Peter*, &c. as if you would intimate to your Readers that I had *wrong'd* them. I might have said with more reason in the *Title* of *mine*, that I *vindicate* the *truth* of the *Holy* * *Scriptures*, in maintaining that *David* committed *Adultery* and *Murder*, besides his *making* Uriah *drunk*, and his *foul dissimulation with God and Man*. Of which although he *repented*, and *writ against*, and put his repentance upon † *record* too; yet before he repented he was *impenitent*, and that for more then *nine Moneths*. These (you know) were the things which I denied to consist with the *power of Godliness*, or with a *state of salvation*, during the *state of impenitence* in which he lived. And I had good reason for it, because you had said in plain *English*, that a man must be *wicked'er* then *David* was at his *worst*, before he could be said to be *notoriously ungodly*, or in a *state of damnation*. And considering the *ground* (or *quick-sand* rather) upon which you build such killing Doctrine; I thought my self bound to leave an *Antidote*

* 2 Sam. 11. 2, 4, 8, 13, 15, 25, 27.

2 Sam. 12. 4-9.

† Psal. 51.

to

to defend my poor Countrey-men from being *poysoned*. For they who can but *presume* that they are *absolutely elected*, and cannot *possibly fall away*, or be in a *state of damnation*, may be apt to sin *greedily*, (which is somwhat *more* then *without regret*,) at least as far as *David* is affirmed by some Preachers to have *sin'd in safety*; and for this they may *appeal* to several books of Mr. *Baxter*. I did not give this *Caveat* in any *ill will* to *you*, Sir, much less to *David*; but in great *good will* to my *weaker brethren*, who the more they * *seem* to themselves to *stand*, the more I would have them to *take heed lest they fall*.

* ὁ δοκῶν ἑστάναι. 1 Cor. 10. 12.

Sect. 5. Hereupon I ask you, Did you promise in your Title-page to *vindicate David* as an *Adulterer*, or as a *Murderer*, or as one who *repented* of all his wickedness? If the *former*, you are professedly a *Pleader* for gross *impiety*; if the *latter*, you have not spoken to the *purpose*, nor resisted any thing at all, but what was the *fruit* of your private *fancy*.

Sect. 6. The same I may say of S. *Peter* also. For I spake against nothing in all his life, except his *cowardize*, and his *perjurie*, and his flat *denial of the Lord Jesus*, for which he *hated* himself, and did not write a *vindication*. I onely spake of such *Puritans* as I described to be *hypocrites*; having onely a *form of godliness*, but *denying the power* of it; the *impurest* creatures in the sight of *God*, and *good men*, as for other reasons, so for this also, that they are the * *purest in their own*. I spake of such *Sequestrations* as were *confessed* to be *unlawful* by eminent Ministers of your *own party*, and that in *print*, nay *detested* by *your self*, if I may credit your *own words*, p. 111. Of all which when you profess to take upon you a *vindication*, I know not *how* you will free your self from *siding with sin* on the one side, or from strange *impertinence* on the other. I will have so fair an opinion of you, as to think you incurr'd this inconvenience by writing *hand over head*, as egged on by the heat of your present *interest* and *passion*, which gave you not time to *consider* that you were writing *against your interest*, and against your *intentions* of

Of Peter, *Puritans, and Sequestrations in the Title-page.*

* { Pro. 30. 12. Isa. 65. 5.

writing

writing *for* it. If this were the *worst*, (as it is really the *best* that I am able to make of so *bad a matter*) I shall be very glad of it, and hope, that as you have *offended* through too much *haste*, so you will make *amends* for it at greater *leisure*. I say, I hope it so much the rather, because if you find you are mistaken, you have offered me your *promise of recantation*.

Sect. 7. You see how willing I am to put the *best* construction upon your words that your words will *bear*: which course I wish you would have taken with *me* and *Grotius*, in stead of the *worst* that you could *fancy* either of *his* words or *mine*. I shall hope to overcome you in nothing more then in the measure of my *civility* and *candid usage*. And therefore I pray do me the justice, whenever you find your self *afflicted* with any portion of my Discourse, to consider from whence the *affliction* riseth. It shall not arise from any such *bitterness* of *words* or *censures*, as *you* and *others* have poured out against *me*, (you indeed much *less* then others) but from the *nature* of your *own matter*, from the condition of your *own failings*, and from the *evidence* of the *conviction* which my conscience forbids me to let you want.

Sect. 8. I shall begin with your *Preface*, and, in that, with your *thoughts of Grotius*; which lying scattered up and down in many parts of your Book, I shall endeavour to gather up (as far as my leisure will permit, and occasion serve) to be considered by themselves in the following Chapter. I shall direct my speech unto your Reverend *self*, not upon any other motive then a civil compliance with *your example*. The former half of your book (which you call a *Preface*) being onely divided into *Sections*, and the later half being printed with a notification of the *pages*; I think it will be my easiest way, *so* to distinguish in my *citations*, as to note the *Sections* onely of the *former*, and onely the *pages* of the *later*. It is in order to my ease, that I *resolve* on this course; and in order to *yours*, that I take this care to *advertise* you.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Grotius, his Religion and Design.

Sect. 1. IN the entrance of your Preface, [*you professe to render me that accompt of your thoughts of* Grotius, *and his English followers, which I was pleased to demand and make your duty. And that you had much rather have been excused from stirring in this unpleasing business any more. Sect.* 1.] I had wondered that in your Title-page you should say you did what you did at Mr. *Pierce his invitation.* I wonder more that in your preface you would say you did it *at my demand.* Truly if I did either, it is more then I know. And I may say, *πῦ πῶς; where*, and *when*, and by *whom* did I *demand* any such thing? Two lines in a letter will suffice you to answer this easie Question.

Sect. 2. It is well you call them *your thoughts of* Grotius, which may be strangely *mistaken*, and yet your *thoughts* still. It had been more for your interest, if you had not pretended in your Title to an undoubted *Discovery of the Grotian Religion*, meaning *his being turn'd Papist*; as you have often explain'd your self. For now we have it under your hand, that you have but discovered *your thoughts of* Grotius. This indeed is a modest and proper speech, because your *thoughts* are such *private* and *hidden* things, that *God alone* can *discern* them whilst you are *silent*: we silly mortalls cannot *come at* them, but by that *discovery* which you are plea'd to make of them. But *Grotius*, whilst he was living, was at once a *publick* and a most *Exemplary* person: much more are his *writings*, since his *Translation*. To make a *Discovery* of the *Sun*, who is best discerned by his own Light, were to suppose the world is *Blind*, and he alone quick-*sighted* who undertakes to *shew* him to all the rest. But to *discover* what a man *thinkes* of the *Sun* or *Moon*, as to the nature of his substance, his sphere, and motion, hath nothing in it either of *singular*, or *absurd*. It is for want of a better thing, that I content my self with this *Resemblance*, in comparing

Grotius,

Grotius unto the *Sun*. His works give *Light* unto the world. They all lye open as well to *me* as to *your self*. You are led by *some Reasons*, to *think* that *Grotius* was a *Papist*; and I have met with many *more*, which make me *know* him to have been *none*.

Of his English Followers.

Sect. 3. But what do you mean by his *English Followers*? Hath any *English-men* of late (either dead or alive) written any Design of *pacification* between the *Protestant* and *Popish* parties? All that can be said is this, that the *unwavering* men of the Church of *England* do love the *writings* of *Grotius* much more then *those* of the *Presbyterians*, and more then the *Presbyterians love* them. Now if to *read* his Books and to *admire* them doth make us fit to be reckon'd amongst his *Followers*, your self must passe for one of the *chiefe*; because you tell me (p. 4.) *You must in gratitude professe, that you have learnt more from* Grotius, *then from almost any Writer in those subjects that ever you read.*] Hardly any can speak higher, unless I except Dr. *Owen*, who saith that *Grotius was almost risse above the pitch of humane Nature*, (if that is the meaning of his Latin, *ultra humanam penè surgisse*) and that in * *all manner of learning*; insomuch that he thinks *there is nothing comparable to him*, (if that is his meaning by *Quicquam ei simile esse vix credo*.) Yet this Gentleman and you have been so far from avowing the being *Followers* of *Grotius*, that ye are the *onely men* amongst us, who have shewed your selves his *publick Enemies*. Although ye vehemently *differed* between *your selves*, yet ye *agreed* in this, that ye were *both* against *Grotius*. Nay, in this your *Agreement* ye *differ'd* too with a witnesse. For *he* would have *Grotius* a *Socinian*, and you a *Papist*. Now a *Papist* and a *Socinian* are not onely so *different*, but so utterly *irreconcileable*, that nothing but *Grotius* his *moderation* can afford any excuse to *one* or *other* of his *Accusers*. You have *justified* Grotius *from the Heresie of Socinianism, which you confesse he hath too oftentimes charged with*, p. 89. And so you have sided with the *Prelatists* against the man before mentioned. *He* again hath freed *Grotius* from the suspicion of being a *Papist*,

* In omni literatura.

pist, (if no *Socinian* can be a Papist, as you know none can) and to hath sided with the *Prelatists* against *your self*. I mean by *Prelatists* the *unchangeable Divines* of the Church of *England*. Such as those two Reverend and Righteous men, Dr. *Hammond* and Mr. *Thorndike*, whom I onely single out for this one reason, because they have vindicated *Grotius* from each *extreme* of the Calumny, which (betwixt you *two*) hath been cast upon him. And to prepare you for the evidence with which I shall afterwards entertain you, as well as to give you some ground to *suspect* your *own* judgment, by letting you see how it differs from such as *theirs*, I think it as usefull as it is pertinent to give you some of their words.

"There is no colour for this suggestion (of *Grotius* his "closeing with the Roman interest) as far as *Grotius* his "writing give us to judge, (and farther then those I have "no perspective to examin his Heart.) For the Fomen- "ters of the Divisions in Christendom being the onely "persons whom he professed to oppose, (the *irreconcili-* "*abiles, & qui æterna cupiunt esse dissidia*) 'tis consequent, "that the *pacificatory interest* was the onely one by him "espoused and pursued most affectionately. And I could "never yet discern by any pregnant indication, that this "is *the Roman interest*.

Dr. Hammonds *words in his second Defence of* Grotius, p.5.

"We have seen two men of repute now amongst us "censure *Grotius* his Labours upon the Scriptures. The "one hath made him a *Socinian*, the other a *Papist*. Both "could have given us no better Argument that he was "*Neither*, then this, that he cannot be *Both*. — I do but "instance in an eminent person, who must needs be a "*Papist*, though never reconciled to the Church of *Rome*; "who must needs be a *Socinian*, though appealing to the "originall consent of the whole Church. Upon what "Termes should there be any such thing as *Papists* or "*Socinians*? I remember an Admonition of his bitter "Adversary Dr. *Rivet*, that the See of *Rome* will never "thank him for what he writ. And from hence I inferred, "as charity obliged me to infer, that the common good

Mr. Thorndikes *words in his Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of* England. Epist. to the Reader, p.5.

"of Christianity, and of God's Church, obliged him to "that, for which he was to expect thanks on no side. "This for certain, *Grotius* never lived by maintaining Di-"vision in the Church: whether any body doth so or "not, I say not; their Master will judge them for it if they "do.

Now Sir, let me tell you, that unlesse you think you have *read* more, or can better *judge* in your Reading of *Grotius* his writings, then the so venerable persons who speak before us, you ought at least to *suspend* your censure; untill you shall find, by all that follows, upon whose Misadventure you ought to place it. If you shall possibly, say that these are two of the *English Followers* of whom you speak, you cannot do *Grotius* a greater pleasure; they having both given blows to the Church of *Rome*, more then all the *whole party* with whom you joyne.

To calumniate Grotius *confessed odious.*

You say, *you do confesse it an odious thing to calumniate so Learned a man as* Grotius, *and all others of his mind and way; and that you must needs repent and recant, if you be guilty of so great a Crime. Sect.* 1.]

Sect. 4. I would very fain know, which are the men of *his way*, as that is distinguished from *his mind*, and seems to signifie his *practice*. And *what way* it is which here you *allude* to obscurely, but do not *name*. I for my part can think of none, but his *not communicating in* France with either *Papists* or *Protestants*. And amongst *us* here in *England*, I know nothing *like* it, except the way of the *Presbyterians*, many of whom for diverse yeares have been so averse unto *Communions*, that in their Churches, the world knows, they have not had *any at all*: yet even *this* way of *his* is sufficient to evidence his being *no Papist*. As I shall shew most clearly in due time and place.

Repentance promised ex hypothesi.

Sect. 5. Because you promise *Repentance* and *Recantation*, *if you be found to be guilty of so great a Crime*, as you call it, *to calumniate such a man as* Grotius; I will first set down how far forth you have *accused him*; next I will manifest his *innocence* of that whereof he stands *charged*; and then I will leave you to consider whether you

you ought not to make him some *Reparations.*

You do not content your self to say, he was a *Favourer of the Papists*, and one who thought not so hardly of them as other *Protestants* have done; or that he was strongly *inclin'd* that way, and put the *best interpretation* upon their Doctrins that they were *capable* of bearing, that the *Peace of Christendom* might not seem so *impossible* as some would make it; or that he stood in a *preparednes of mind* to reconcile himself unto the *Papists*, upon condition the *Papists* also would reconcile themselves unto the *moderate Protestants*, and the moderate Protestants unto *them*; (for this had been to say no more then I can say of *Thuanus*, that he *favoured the Protestants* on all occasions, although he remained a *Papist still*:) But you have said in grosse Termes, *That he took it for his glory to be a Roman Catholick*, *Sect.* 2. *That he turned Papist*, p. 11. *That he drope by this meanes into a deplorable Schism*, *Ibid.* So as if I shall demonstrate that there was never any such thing, *and that* Grotius *did not turn Papist*, no, no more then Mr. *Baxter himself*, (who yet hath been branded for a *Papist* as well as *Grotius*; and by an eminent *Presbyterian* also, that is, by one of your *own party*;) I shall at once open a way to shew the *Nullity* of your *reasons*, and the *Necessity* of your *Repentance*, of which you have made me to live in *hope*. My reasons or *Arguments* are these that follow.

Grotius *accused of turning* Papist.

Arg. 1. In his Epistle to *Laurentius*, who had written against him as a *Papist* whilest yet he liv'd, (as you have done after his Death) intitling his Book, *Grotius Papizans*, he doth expressly *disown* the charge, — *facile videbis non Grotium Papizare, sed Laurentiadem nimis Calvinizare.* Now when I find him expressly *disowning Popery*, (even *after* his *Notes* upon *Cassander*,) who certainly knew his own mind best; and when I find you declaring, *that every man shall by you be taken for that which he professeth to be*, (p. 23.) and again, *that you would take men to be of the Religion which they professe*, p. 98. and that you will *believe the profession of* Grotius (p. 89.) I know not

Proved to be none by 19. *Arguments.*
Grot. Animadv. in Animadv. Rivetti, p. 83.

 how

how you can chuse but see your error. But come we from *writing* to word of *mouth*.

Arg. 2. There lives a person of great *Honour* and of great *Renown* for his *Wisdom*, as well as for his great *Learning* and *Moderation*; and the eminent *employments* he hath been in, who hath affirmed in my *hearing*, (and not in my hearing only,) *That being conversant with* Grotius *during his Embassy in* France, *he took his time to ask* Grotius, *why he did not communicate with either party.* Grotius made him this Answer, *That with the* Papists *he could not, because he was not of their mind; with the* Calvinists *he could not, (not only because of his Embassy from* Swedeland, *where they were not Followers of* Calvin, *but also) because he was discovered by their pernicious Doctrine of* God's *Decrees.* To this he added, *That he would gladly communicate with the Church of* England, *if his condition of Embassador would well permit, expressing an ample* * *Approbation of our Doctrine and Discipline, as also heavily wishing to live and die in that Communion.* I do not *name* that Noble person who is the Author of this Relation, because I have not yet ask'd his leave. If you can trust to my integrity, I need not say more; if not, I can produce him for *unquestionable a witness*, as I am very confident you cannot but trust. However, you find it to be *agreeable* to what *himself* whilst he was living made known *in print*; and you shall find it agreeable to that which follows. For,

* This part will be attested by a Reverend person of our Church, Mr. *Matthias Tuner*, who was personally conversant with *Grotius* some yeares in *France*, and whose excellent skill in Greek and Hebrew did make him the fitter for such converse; as will it also by a *great Personage distinct* from him in my Text.

Arg. 3. Many are able to attest, that 'twas the *last advice* which he thought it his duty to give his *wife*, that she would declare him to *dye* in that Communion in which he desired that she her self would still *live*. This she manifested accordingly, by coming on purpose to our Church at Sir *Richard Brownl. House*, (the King of *England*'s Resident there in *France*,) where from the hands of Mr. *Gunder* she received the

the * *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*. And this immediately after her Husband's Death, as soon as Reasons of State did cease to hinder.

* Of this Sir Thomas Dirfet professeth himself an *Eye-witness*, and that her *two daughters* received with her.

Arg. 4. This is agreeable with the reports which I and others have met with in the publick place of his *conversation* for divers years towards his last. I took my pension in *Paris* near *Clermont College*, in which *Petavius* had then a being: and all I could learn from my inquiry was truly this, that all took *Grotius* for a person of unparalleled abilities in every kind, but yet extremely to be lamented, as one who could not be brought into the *bosom of the Church*, that is to say, they could not perswade him to be a *Papist*. And I was lately assured by Mr *Castiglio*, (a learned person, and a religious, and so a very *true speaker*,) that in a conference which he had with some *Augustine Friers* with whom he travelled, he found that *Grotius was an heretick in their esteem*, as much as any other *Protestants* who were not followers of *Calvin*. And I am very much mistaken if that which Mr *Knott* hath cited from *Grotius* (p. 187.) against Mr *Chillingworth*, is not purposely cited as from one of our *own side*. I have also been told (by a worthy person) of a message sent from *Grotius* to Doctor *Cosin*: *that he should die in the Faith of the Church of England*. But because I want the same evidence of this, which I am sure I have of other things, I do not urge it as any new Argument.

Arg. 5. But it is (some) another Argument, and of very great moment, that so *judicious* an Author as Doctor *Hammond*, in his *Continuation of the Defence of Grotius*, did think it had ground sufficient to say what follows, viz. "*Thus Grotius had always a signal care and kindness for this our English Church and Nation: expressing his opinion, that of all Churches in the world, it was the most conformable to the primitive and purest; and more than intimating his desire, to end his days in the bosom and communion of our Mother.* Now because

Dr. Ham. Cont. of Def. of H. Grot. p. 29.

because it is added by so *credible a speaker* as Doctor *Hammond*, that *of this he wants not store of witnesses who from time to time had heard it from his own mouth, whilst he was Ambassador* in France, *and even in his return to* Sweden *immediately before his death*; and because *my witnesses* (before mentioned) are *distinct from his*, who yet agree in the thing attested; I have added *his* intelligence as a very good Argument to back *mine own*, which having said, I proceed to argue as I began, from several testimonies of *Grotius* concerning *himself*.

Ibid.

Grot Annal. l.1.p.8,9,10, 11,12.

Arg.6. As in his *Annals* (*de rebus Belgicis*) he strictly censures the *corruptions* which by little and little the *Popes* had obtruded upon the *Church*, and discovers the *Need* of *Reformation* into which Christendom had been brought by the power and prevalence of those corruptions; so likewise in his *Histories*, (which I have reason to believe were some of the *last* things he perfected) he clearly *sides* with our *English* Protestants against the *pretensions* of *Religion* which came from *Rome*. *Sixtus Quintus* (the then-Pope) together with his *Anathema's* and *Indulgences* and other tricks of Religion, are exposed both to the *Censure* and the *Derision* of all his Readers. He shews himself *plead* in his observation, that as the *Romanists* had *imposed* upon the rudeness and *simplicity* of *former* Ages, so they had happily been *detected* by the *sagacity* of the *later*. And what is this but to *applaud* (though not the *seditious* lovers of *change*, such as the *Taylor* was at *Munster*, and the *Picture-drawer* at *Leyden*, yet) the *Regular* attempters of *Reformation*?

Præmium addidit scelerì scelerum immunitatem, etiam apud Deum: atque alia id genus ludibria, quæ rudibus seculis haud invalida nunc tantùm in speciem daptur, in speciem accipiuntur, &c. *Hist. lib.* 1.p.117.

Annal. l.1. p.9.

Arg.7. In his *Poem* præfixed before his Notes upon *Cassander*, he did not onely commend *Cassander*, and call his writings *veracia scripta*, for acknowledging the *corruptions* of the Church of *Rome*, and favouring the Articles of the *Augustan Confession*, (which by the way gives answer to one of your principal objections p. 31. occasion'd by your mistake of *veracia scripta*) but he magnified very

very much the pacifick methods of *Melanchthon*, *Witelius*, *Mostrevius*, the Bishop of *Spalato*, in his *departure from* Rome, *K. James*, and *Casaubon*, (of whose pacifick design King *James* was Author) who being confessed to have been *Protestants*, and to have meditated the *peace* of the Christian world without any *prejudice* to the *Reformed* parts of it, had not certainly been applauded, without exception to their *design* or to the means they contrived for its *attainment*, by so intelligent a person as *Grotius* was, if he had really been a *Papist*, as you suggest: much *less* had he reckoned their several purposes and endeavours as so many *Standards* or *Measures* by which he hoped *Posterity* would judge of *His*. It is true, he set down the Canons of the *Council of Trent*, as one of the great things to be considered towards an *union*; but so did he also the whole *Protestant Confession* agreed upon at *Augusta*, betwixt which and the other a *reconcilement* was to be made. If the *former* spake him a *Papist*, the *later* spake him a *Protestant*. And if at *once* he was *both*, he was indeed a great *Hocus*. But he pleads for himself, his having set out the Creed as well of the *Protestants* as of the *Papists* (Discuss. p. 7.) as it were on purpose to shew the difference betwixt a *making of peace*, and a *turning Papist*.

Quem prædulce juvat stillante
Melanchthone Nectar;
Qui *Witelli* chartas *Mostrevii*, lēg's;
Quique putas Regem multum
sapuisse *Britannum*,
Cū sua mādavit sen'a *Casaubonide*;
Accipe.. sed nostro labor hic si
displicet ævo,
A gratâ pretium posteritate ferret.

Arg. 8. In *his Animadversions* upon *Rivet's*, he puts a very vast difference between the Synods at *Dort* and at *Augusta*; and between the * *Protestants* who follow *either*: the *want* of which observation in all his Conciliatory writings, I suppose a main cause of your numerous mistakes. And the *supply* of that *want* will serve to shew you the levity of the *greatest part* of your objections. Indeed the *rigid Presbyterians*, whose *Life* and *Doctrine* proclaim'd them *Bouteseus* and *Rebels*, he commonly marks as an implacable and an unreconcileable sort of men, as it were *made* for the *subversion* of *Church* and *State*; and professed enemies to *Peace*

* Pag. 47

its

* *it self*, as well as to those that dare *attempt it*. But for *Melanchthon* and *Casaubon*, and other *such* Protestants as did desire to *reconcile*, not to *rule over* their brethren, he every where *commends* them, and joyns himself to them, and professeth he can never † *enough* commend them. Nor could he be any whit more a *Papist* for speaking fairly of the Canons of *Trent*; then Bishop *Caraffa* could be a *Protestant* for speaking * as fairly of the *Augustan Confession*. You should therefore have *distinguish'd* betwixt *Protestants* and *Protestants*, (as the rest of the World hath ever done) when you said that *Grotius* did write against them. For there are *Protestants* that *disgrace*, and there are that *adorn* the Reformation. There are that *would* have *peace*, and there are that *will* have *war*. *Grotius* speaks no more kindly of *any* Papists, then you your self do of *some* (p.10.) He speaks no more sharply of the *worst* Protestants in the world, then *you* do of the *best* (p.113. &c.) So that pelting at *him*, you have hit *your self*. To the sons of sedition and disobedience, who look upon themselves as *twice-resin'd* Christians, our Reverend Doctor *Sanderson* hath been as severe as any *Grotius*. But will you say in general terms, that Doctor *Sanderson reproacheth Reformation it self*, and that (without a distinction) he *writes against Protestants*? yet thus * you use *Grotius* in divers places; nay in *one* you use him *worse*. For you say, *he reproacheth the Reformation, as an impious, tumultuary, rebellious thing* (p.76,77.) when the *Latine* which you cite, had you translated it into *English*, would have made the common people your great *admirers*. They would have seen (what now I tell them) that *Grotius* spake not a word of the regular Protestants here in *England*, nor of such in *Germany* and *France* as were of the spirit of *Melanchthon*; but he spake of those † Incendiaries, who measured th:

* Quod tam apertè se non dicam mihi, sed paci profiteatur infestum (D. *Rivetus*) in eo vicit expectationem meam. *Animadv. in Animadv.* p.3.

† Sunt mihi communia cum viris nunquam satis laudatis, *ibid.* p.5.

* *Ibid.* p.4,5.

* p.73,74,76.

† Seditiones, vim contra Principes, Imperiorum mutationes ex usu suo, morem frangendi arces sacras, & bella excitandi & fovendi, sub sancto Evangelii nomine; inventerunt quidam & dogmata in id comparata, ut homines de misericordia Dei nimium sibi pollicentes, in peccatis indormiscerent. *Discuss.* p.16.

the truth of Religion by their *distance* onely from *Rome*; and did as well *introduce*, as *cast out* Errors; and that not peaceably, but by *sedition* and *sacrilege*, and *force of arms*, by *inventing* also such *Doctrines* as might make men *presume upon the mercy of God*, and so lie *snorting in those sins* which opened them a way to Wealth and Greatness, by the violation of Gods *Law*, in pretence of propagating his *Gospel*. Will you, Sir, take part with such *Protestants* as *these*, or write against *Grotius* as a *Papist* for writing against such as uphold the *Papists* by their *profaneness*? I will not guess at your *thoughts* when you were writing your 53d *Section*; nor spread a Net of *Dilemma's* whereby to catch your true *meaning*; because I would not be more pungent then the subject matter doth *enforce*. *Grotius* spake of the *Brownists*, and of those that *like* them, as well as of those that are like *unto them*. *Quibus quis placere, ab eorum veneno intactus, postulet?*

Insanientibus *Brunistis*, & si qui eorum sint similes, &c. *ibid.*

Arg. 9. In the same book of *Animadversions* I find him joyning with the *Protestants* in what they say touching the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*; speaking of the most *moderate*, whom he ever concludes the most *worthy Protestants*. And with *them* he demonstrates how the most *moderate Papists* may be *agreed*; by a *commodious* explication of *words* and *meanings* on either side. Nor doth he say in that place that the *Protestants* Article should be conformed to the *Papists*, but that *This* should be made to comply with *That*. Nay he addes expressly, that the whole *Protestant Form* should be received and accepted, as he had taken it out of the *Acts* agreed upon at *Poissy*; where, excepting *Peter Martyr*, not one dissented.

Si quiescant Scholasticæ Disputationes, quid est cur non verba Concilii *Tridentini* explicari commodè possint, &c. aut etiam recipi illa formula quam ex Actis *Possiacenis* desumpsi, & quam omnes qui ibi tum erant Protestantes (excepto uno *P. Mart.*) approbarunt? *Animadv. p.* 29, 30.

Arg. 10. After this, when he speaks to the twenty-first *Article*, he reckons himself with the *Protestants*, by way of discrimination from *all the Papists*, comprehending even the *French* as well as the *Spanish* and *Italian*.

[If *we* should count them *all* Idolaters who live in Communion with the *Romanists*, it would extremely hinder our wish'd-for union.] This he renders for the reason, why he who laboured a *Reconcilement* (which would have carried with it a *Reformation*) was not in reason to accuse the whole *Universe* of *Papists* (without exception) of the greatest crime in the world; making them *odium* to others, as well as *implacable* in themselves, and most of all with the *Reconciler*: It being his office, not to *widen* breaches, but to *contract* them; not to *imbitter*, but *emollitate* the minds of men, especially of the great and prevailing party. The words of *Grotius* have this rational importance, [I saw it would hinder our Reconcilement, if we (who are *Protestants*) should repute for Idolaters even *all* that are of the *Roman* Church or Communion, though too many of them indeed are *such*.] This appears by the word *omnes*, compared with *haberemus*, and with the person's *Religion* to whom he *speaks*.

Videbam multum obstare concordiæ, si omnes eos qui in communione sunt Romanâ pro Idololatris haberemus, gnarus Idololatriam esse eminentissimum seculi crimen, *ib.p.* 43, 44.

Arg. 11. In his *Votum pro pace*, he professeth that even the *moderate* and most *peaceable Romanists* were of a *different communion* from that whereof he professeth *himself* to be. * He deploreth the *superstition*, with other corruptions and abuses, which he saw had invaded the *Church of Rome*. He saith *Cassander's Consultation* was commended to him by † *Casaubon* a famous *Protestant*. And that his labour thereupon was approved in *France* * by both the opposite parties. He shews what † *Remedies* there are to cure the *Popes* of their *Disease*, to put Hooks in their Nostrills, and in despight of their ambition to preserve the just *Rights* of *Kings* and *Bishops*. Nay he acknowledgeth the * *Right* of the Kings of *Britain* about all *Ecclesiastical* both *Things* and *Persons*: which for a *Papist* to have done,

Verti me ad eos legendos qui etsi fuere in *Communione diversa*, animum tamen magis ad sanandas, quàm ad fovenda divortia appulere. *Vo. pro pace, p.* 9. * *p.* 7, 8, 9.

† *p.* 10.
* *Ibid.*

† Permpta sunt in *Galliis Hispaniisq;* Remedia quibus impediuntur Papæ, ne aut Regum aut Episcoporum jura invadant. *p.* 12.

* *Ibid.*

done, would have implied a *contradiction*. But any thing will be *Popery* with them that *out-act* their Master *Calvin*; who † accused *that change* in the *Church of England*, which was made by the *advice* of so known a *Protestant* as *Bucer*, of no lesser a crime then downright *Papisme*: which unreasonable censure of our Church, whether his *passion* or his *judgement* extorted from him, and whether it was not a *contradiction* to what he spake of her at other times, I leave you to guesse by his large Epistle to the Protector, and that (you know) was in the dayes of King *Edward the sixth*. But if to *accuse* were sufficient, it is sufficient that Mr. *Calvin* was accused of *Judaisme* by *one*; by *another*, of *Turcisme*; by a *third*, of *Fratricide*; by almost *all* the *Lutherans*, of the *Arian heresie*; and even by *Grotius* himself, (who hardly ever spake in passion, or without a just ground) of a *contumelious and turbulent spirit*, and of *virulently handling such men as were much his betters*.

† Et illam mutationem, quæ Bucero Consilio in Anglia erat instituta, *Papismi* accusavit. *pag.* 115.

Redolens plane *Calvini* spiritum contumeliosum illū ac turbulentū. *Animadv. p.* 81.

Quum sciam quàm inique & virulente tractaverat viros multo se meliores, &c. *ibid. pag.* 9.

Arg. 12. In his *Epistles* to the *French-men* of either party, he doth so *frequently* and so *clearly* discover himself to be a *Protestant*, that out of *them* it were easie to write a *volume* in his defence. To give you an instance in as *few* as I may, and not in as *many* as I am able. * He writes against the *seven Sacraments* (I mean against the *number* of them, and against four of that number) so tenaciously retained by all *Rome*. He speaks snarply of the † *Jesuits*, (from his meer humanity to *one* of the *best* of which order, you hastily conclude him to be a *Papist*, p. 86.) and would have their evil Arts *set out to the life*; as an anonymous *Jansenian* hath lately done. If his *esteem* of *Petavius*, a lover of unity and moderation, could make you think him a *Papist*; you must also suppose him to be a *Protestant*, for *disesteeming* many *more* of the very same Order;

* *Epist.* 154. *Johanni Cordesio*, *p.* 378. *Epist.* 166. *Eidem*, *p.* 408.

† *Epist.* 154. *p.* 377.

der, especially when he reckons that *he* and *they* are of *two Religions*: as indeed he doth in one Epistle; where he also calls the Pope the *Patriarch of the West*, and shews what it is which he would have towards a peace, even the spirit of *Melanchthon* on the one side, and of *Cassander* on the other, and a mutual forbearance with one another [ὅτι τὰ μὴ ἀναγκαῖα] in things which are not *simply necessary*. Will not every *good Protestant* desire the *same*? yet *he* went farther, and accounted *them* of * *his party* who would not hear of any such thing. Such was *his* moderation towards that sort of men who had *none at all*.

Dubium est, apud *meos*, an apud *Jesuitas* magis vapulem, &c. *Epist.* 14. *pag.* 36, 37. *Hom. Villerie.*

* Apud *meos* quidem, quod illud apud ipsos μεγάδοξον defendo, posse in unaquaque Ecclesia ferri eos qui dissideant in rebus non plane necessariis, *ibid.*

Arg. 13. I find that *Grotius* his desire of helping forward the *peace* of *Christendom* was the same in the *former* as in the *later* part of his life; and so was his *love* to the *Church of England*: * witness his *sixth Chapter De Imperio summarum potestatum circa sacra*, wherein he doth not onely insist upon the *same means* of *union*, for which he pleads in his later writings, but exceedingly commends our *English Canon* agreed upon in the year 1571. exactly tending to the very same end. *Inprimis vero videbunt Concionatores, nequid unquam dicant pro Concione quod à populo religiosè teneri & credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit Doctrinæ Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, quodq; ex illâ ipsâ Doctrinâ Catholici Patres & Veteres Episcopi collegerint.* Because the Scripture is made a *Lesbian Rule* by a great variety of Professors who are *irreconcileable amongst themselves*, therefore no *Exposition* ought to be taken for *authentick*, so soon as that which hath been made by the *Catholick Fathers and Ancient Bishops of the Church*. In a word, it doth appear, as well by * *Casaubon's* and Bishop *Overall's* Epistles to *Grotius*,

* In ipsis Remediis quæ tertiarii medici vocant, parum est auxilii. Neque potest partium unitas, nisi à corporis unitate, sperari. Non possum non laudare præclarum *Anglia Canonem* An. Dom. 1571. &c. *De Imperio sum. po. circa sacra, cap.* 6.

* *Casaub. Epist.* 210. *Hu. Gro.* 1612. & *Epist.* 221. *&c.*

Grotius, as from *his* to *them*, and to *Thuanus*, and divers others, that his desires of *union* were no other then what were common to *him* with the sobereſt *Proteſtants* in the World; in particular with *Melanchthon*, whom he propoſeth as his *exemplar* in all his writings of that affair. Nay in two Epiſtles to *Duraus* (which a learned * admirer of his Works hath very uſefully made *Engliſh*) he is as palpably a *Proteſtant* as Cardinal *Bellarmin* was a *Papiſt*; for he clearly *juſtifies* our *breach* with *Rome*, and heartily wiſheth our agreement amongſt our ſelves, however hindered by thoſe who *defile* themſelves with a proud conceit of being *holier* and *purer* then their *Fathers* and *Brethren* of the Church. He *unites* his Conſultations with both our *Engliſh Embaſſadors* how our *union* may be accompliſhed: to which he exhorts ſo much the rather, becauſe he obſerves that our *Diviſion* doth ſtrengthen *Popery*, and make *Proſelytes* for *Rome*. Such were *Grotius* his Counſels no longer ſince then in the year of our Lord 1637. And though you confidently ſay, that *He mentions the* Proteſtants *with diſtaſte, as pretended Reformers* (p.33.) yet I know the contrary to be a very great truth. For how ſeverely ſoever he uſeth to ſpeak of the *rebellious* and *ſacrilegious*, who by their Heatheniſh practiſes and opinions had put a publick diſgrace on the *Reformation*, (in pretending themſelves the Authors of it,) yet of *regular Proteſtants* he never ſpeaks without *love* and *reverence*, and ſimply calls them *the Reformed*, in oppoſition to *Pontificians* who ſtand in need of Reformation. That *unavowable* ſort of *Proteſtants* whom he reproves with *ſharpneſs*, the meek and moderate † Dr. *Sanderſon* rebuketh as *ſharply* as he hath done, yet he is not the likelier to be a *Papiſt*.

Mr. Clement Barkſdale *in his Memorials of* Grotius.

* Traxit in auxilium ſui *Reformatorum* Principes; & Pontificiorum fervidiores meam præſentiam aliis de cauſis ſuſpectam. *Epiſt.* 172. p.421. A.D.1635.

† *Look forward on ch.5. ſect.9.*

*Arg.*14. From *many places* of his *Diſcuſsio* (printed in the year 1645.) as well as from its whole *deſign*, his *averſion* to *Papiſm* doth very ſufficiently appear. And as *that* is the *book* from whence you draw your *objections*, ſo from *that* very *book* you could not have fail'd of *ſatisfaction*, had

had you impartially either *read* or *considered* all. * His desire that the rules of *Vincentius Lirinensis* might be observed, was common to *him* with King *James*, *Isaac Casaubon*, yea with *Gregory Calixtus*, and Doctor *Reynolds against Hart*. † He would not onely have the *Canons* of the *Council of Trent* to be *commodiously expounded* in order to *peace*, but also in order to *reformation*; he would have *all taken away* which evil *customes* and *manners* have *introduced*. In a word, he would have *that*, then which the *Augustan Confession* desires *no more*. And many moderate *Papists* desired *no less*. He allowes the *Pope* no * other *Primacy* then is allowed by the *Canons* of *ecumenical Councils*, and may consist with the *rights* of the several *Patriarchs of the East*; disapproving his *usurpations* no lesse then *Casaubon himself*. † He loves to style that *Usurper* by the modest name of the *Bishop of Rome*; and fastens the *Primacy* (which he allowes) not so much on the *Pope*, as the *Church* of *God*, for *Zanchy* himself doth so expresse her.

* *Discuss.p.10.*

† Nec aliud desiderat Confessio *Augustana*. Dicunt enim qui eam amplexi sunt Principes & Civitates, de nullo Articulo Fidei dissentire se &c. sed paucos abusus à se omitti, qui novi sunt, & contra voluntatem Canonum, vitio Temporum recepti. *ib.p.14.*

* *Ibid.p.18.*

† *Ibid.p.15.*

*Arg.*15. To prove he speaks as a *Peace-maker* (which he was) not as a *Papist*, (which he was not) he cites the *Declarations* of some *chief* * *Protestants* in the behalf of *such* a *Primacy* as *he* and *they* have thought due to the *Roman Prelate*. Not onely King *James*, who granted as much (in a manner) as *Cardinal Perron* exacted of him, in order to the *Unity* and *Peace* of *Christendom*, not onely *Bucer* a moderate *Protestant*, but even *Blondel*, the Patron of *Presbyterians*, and even *Calvin* himself are brought in speaking to his advantage: (to whom I might adde *Franciscus Junius*, and our learned *Mountagne* in his *Appeal to Cæsar*.) The words of *Blondel* are very remarkable, *Non negari à* Protestantibus *dignitatem Sedis Apostolicæ* Romanæ, *neque Primatum ejus super Ecclesias vicinas, immo aliquatenus super omnes, sed referri hæc ab iis ad jus Ecclesiasticum*. Nor can I remember I ever read, that *Grotius* pretended to any more. For *obedience* due from all *secu-*

* *Ibid.p.69.*

lars

lars unto the *Bishops of the Church*, he cites the * *Augustan Confession*. For the *want of reformation* in the *Presbyterian* Churches, he cites the † *Confession* of Mr. *Rivet*. For the admitting of such words as *Transelementation* and *Transubstantiation*, with their convenient explications, in order to *Peace* and *Reconcilement*, ‡ he cites *Modrevius* and our King *James*. For the *Protestants* return to the *Church* of *Rome*, upon condition that *that Church* will also return unto the *Primitive*, he cites the *Prayers* and *Protestation* of learned *Zanchy*, who notwithstanding his being a *Presbyterian*, concluded his *moderation* like an *Episcopal Divine*; *Ego* Hieronymus Zanchius *septuagenarius*, *cum tota familia mea, testatum hoc volo tui Ecclesia Christi in omnem æternitatem.* The same *Zanchy* did acknowledge (in the seventieth year of his age,) that the *Church of Rome* was a true *Church of Christ*, (however defiled with innovations) because she *retained the fundamentals of Christianity*. See *Zanchy's Preface* to his ‖ *Confession*, and compare it with what he saith in the *Confession it self*, *Art.* 8. *de Eccles. Milit. p.* 149. and again with his *p.* 157. where he doth not scruple to use these words. [† *We have not simply, and in all things made a defection from the Church of* Rome, *but in those things alone wherein she hath departed from the Church Apostolical, and so by consequence from her ancient and purer self. Nor have we left her (even so) but with an intention to return, as soon as she shall return her self to that pitch of integrity from which she fell.*] All which being considered, either let *Grotius* have been a *Protestant*, as well as *Zanchy* and *Blondel*; or let them *both* have been *Papists*, as well as *Grotius*. No other *Primacy* to the *Papedom* did he allow but what † *Melanchthon thought*

* *Ibid. p.* 70.

† *Ibid. p.* 73.

‡ *Ibid. p.* 77.

Ab Ecclesiâ Romanâ non alio discessimus animo, quàm ut, si correcta ad priorem Ecclesiæ formam redeat, nos quoque ad illam revertamur, & communionem cum illâ in suis porrò cœtibus habeamus. Apud *Grot. p.* 14. apud ipsum *Zanch. in Confess. Art.* 19. *p.* 157.

‖ *Edit. Neostadii Palat. A. D.* 1585.

† Non ab Ecclesiâ Rom. simpliciter & in omnibus defecimus, sed in illis duntaxat rebus in quibus ipsa defecit ab Apostolicâ, atque adeò a seipsâ veteri & purâ Ecclesiâ; neque alio discessimus animo *&c. ut supra. Zanch. ib. p.* 157.

† Fatente *Melanchthone*, *Primatum* (secundum Canones) *necessarium esse ad retinendam unitatem*, *Discuss. p.* 255. 256.

necessary

necessary to conserve the unity of the Church. Not would he have all to joyn with *Rome* as *Rome* now stands, which yet you confidently suggest, *p.*35.) but upon friendly condescensions on *either side*; implying * *Reformation* in some particulars, and *mutual forbearance* in many others. You confesse that Bishop *Bramhall* allowes the Pope to have his *old Patriarchal power*, and his *Primacy of order*, and somewhat else, *p.*22. whom yet you take not to be a *Papist*, p.23. Not can I see that *Grotius* allowes him more. And as *Principium unitatis*, or *Concordia coagulum*, you will certainly allow it as well as *Grotius*.

* Vide (inter alia complusculа) *Grot. Animadv. in Animadv. A. Rivetti p.*35. *Vot. pro pa.*7,8,9. *Discuss. p.*160. 161.18.20. *etiam p.*71,72.

*Arg.*16. If you compare one passage of his *Discussio* (*p.*256.) with his Epistle to *Cordesius* (*p.*352.) you will find him so *steadfastly* and pertinaciously a *Protestant*, that the largest offers of a *King* could not make him any thing else. You say, *the* French *moderation is acceptable to all good men*, you think that many such Papists are *blessed souls now with Christ*; and you pronounce *that Nation an honorable part of the Church of Christ*, p. 10. yet all the advantages in the world could never work upon *Grotius* to have communion even with *them*, no not at that point of time when the *Calvinists* had deprived him of his *liberty*, of his *livelihood*, and (in preparednesse of minde) of his very *life*. In the *depth* of his poverty, immediately after his *bonds*, and *banishment*, and *confiscation of goods*, he refused the great offers which daily courted him in *France*. I pray observe in what *words* he confuted that *calumny* which *Rivet* was bold to cast upon him. *Si* Grotius, *tanto viro invitante, voluisset id promittere, quod eum promisisse fingit D.* Rivetus, *poterat ille, per malos* Calvinistas *exutus patriâ, exutus bonis, ampla illa honorum & commodorum promissa adipisci, quæ à Rege* Galliæ *nunquam aut habuit, aut speravit, neque illi opus fuisset exire* Galliâ, *& rebus alterius regni operam suam addicere. Et nunc quoque, cum omnia adferat ad pacem Ecclesiæ restituendam quæ potest, nihil illi dat* Gallia,

* Gratias ago summæ Regi, quod in me etiam absentem beneficia sua depluere voluerit; & amicis, quod meis commodis tam perseveranter invigilent. Cæterum ego, ex quo *Gallias* reliqui, nullam cur tali beneficio utar probabilem causam video; ideoque comiter excusari volo. *Epist.*143. *ad* Cordes. *p.*352.

lis, & si dare velit, nihil ille accipiat, Discuss. p. 258. Here you see the great reason why he went *out* of *France*, when courted *in* it; and why he chose to serve a *poorer*, because a *Protestant* State. As he never had been brought to accept of any thing from *France*, so you see he resolved he *never would*.

Arg. 17. That *Grotius* did never *once communicate* with any *part* of the Church of *Rome*, is a manifest sign he was never of them: and he gives such *reasons* for his own abstinence from *all communion* in *France* (with either *Papists* or *Presbyterians*) as could not possibly be pretended by any *Romanist* whatsoever; and so they prove *him* (by consequence) to have been *none*, for whose *excuse* or *defence* they were pretended. Discuss. p. 59, 60, 61.

Arg. 18. Whilest you say he *turn'd Papist*, you clearly grant him to have been *Protestant*: it lies upon you then to prove that he *renounced* the *one*, in *exchange* for the *other*; and you must shew both *when* and *where* he did it. For whosoever *turns Papist*, is ever bound by *them* to whom he turns, to make an *abrenunciation of all other Churches*; upon which he is *solemnly reconciled, and received into the bosom of that at* Rome: of which you have the Queen *Christina* and the late Minister of *Montauban* exhibited as examples in the *Weekly News-book*. Had *Grotius* been such a *Convert*, (in their language) or such an *Apostate*, (in ours) the Church of *Rome* had been *proud* of it then of a *thousand* such *Queens* as now I mentioned, and their *Gazetts* had told us of it with great *ambition*. But in the *place* that you have said (in a matter of *Fact* too) you have not *pretended* any such thing, how unadvisedly soever you have *implied* it.

Arg. 19. Notwithstanding all that I have urged to prove that *Grotius* was no *Papist*, I shall adde one Argument from the signal manner of his *Death*, which will also be much confirmed from the *place* and *manner* of his *burial*: they are *both* attested by Doctor *Quistorp* a *Lutheran* Divine, and so no *Papist*, at the earnest entreaty of an eminent person, as known a *Protestant* as *Quistorp*; and

they are published by *both*, to embalm the memory of that *Phœnix of learned men*, as learned *Quistorp* doth fitly call him. Had *Grotius* been a *Papist* upon his *death-bed*, he would not have *admitted*, much less have *sent for*, a *Protestant* Minister to assist him in his last and greatest triall. Not would the *chief Pastor* of *Rostock*, the publick *Professor* of *Divinity*, have given his Narrative to the World with so much *Eulogie* as he hath done, much lesse would he have *buried* him in the *most honorable place* of the *chiefest Temple*; not would *the Protestant Governours* have consented with so much *readiness* as they did, had there been any the least *suspicion* of *Grotius* his dying a *Roman Catholick*. Now though the testimony of *Quistorp* was printed first at *Amsterdam*, and again by *Merick Casaubon* in his *De usu verborum*, (1647.) translated *in part* by the very reverend Doctor *Hummond*, and *wholly* by † Master *Barksdale*; yet because the *manner* of that religious man's end hath been most *slanderously reported*, and because the *true* Narrative is not *ordinarily* known, as well as earnestly *desired* to be made as ordinary as may be, (there being thousands who have not seen it in the books before mentioned) I think fit to subjoyn it in Doctor *Quistorp's own words*.

* In his *Answer to the Animadv. on his Dissert.* p. 132.
† Behind his *Translation of Grot. de Jure Belli & Pacis.*

Hugonis Grotii *P. M. ultima:*

Quibus Joanni Quistorpio *S. S. Theologiæ D. Professori, Facultatis ejusdem Seniori, & Primarii Templi* Rostochiensium *Pastori, suum ob peccata dolorem, & spem salutis confessus est.*

CONtendis à me, *N. N.* ut perscribam, *quem, mundo huic valedicturus, Literatorum Phœnix* Hugo Grotius *sustulerit. En paucis id habe. Conscenderat ille* Stockholmia *navim qua* Lubecam *ferretur; vehementibus per triduum in mari jactatus procellis naufragium patitur, & ægre ad* Cassubix *litora appellit. Inde per quam incommodo curru, pluvia tempestate, per sexaginta & plura milliaria, tandem*

Rosto-

Rostochium *nostrum devehitur. Divertit ad* Balemannii-am. *D.* Stocmannum *Medicum advocari curat, qui ætate, naufragio, incommodis itineris fractas vires adverteus, vitæ terminum imminere præsagit. Secundo ab ingressu in hanc urbem die (qui Stil. vet. erat* 18. Augusti) *me horâ nonâ vespertinâ ad se vocat. Accessi: propemodum in Agone virum constitutum offendi: compellavi, & me nihil maluisse affirmavi, quam ut mihi cum ipso iucolumi sermones sociare licuisset. Regerit ille, Ita Deo visum fuit. Pergo; ut ad beatam emigrationem se componat, peccatorem agnoscat, super commissa doleat, moneo: quumq; inter loquendum Publicani peccatorem se fatentis, & ut Deus sui misereretur precantis, meminissem; respondet, Ego ille sum Publicanus. Progredior; ad Christum, extra quem nulla est salus, ipsum remitto. Subjicit ille, In solo Christo omnis spes mea est reposita.*

Ego clara voce precationem illam Germanicam Germanicè *recitabam,* Herr Jesu, wahrer Mensch und Gott, &c. *Ille complicatis manibus submissa voce me insequebatur. Quum finivissem, quæsivi an me intellexisset. Respondit, Probè intellexi.*

Pergo illa recitare ex verbo Dei quæ jamjam morituris in memoriam revocari solent: Quæro, an me intelligat. Resp. Vocem tuam audio, sed quæ singula dicas difficulter intelligo.

Quum hæc dixisset, plane conticuit, & brevi post spiritum exhalavit, in puncto duodecimæ nocturnæ. Habes Catastrophen vitæ ab Grotio *summo viro actæ. Cadaver Medicis post commissum est. Intestina lebeti aheneo imposita, ut in Templi apud nos Primarii* Mariæ *Virgini sacri locum honoratissimum reponerentur, à Templi Præfectis facile impetravi. Molliter cineres cubent. Vale. Dabam* Rostochii *propedie Michaelis, Anno* 1645.

Tuus, J. Quistorpius.

My Argument from hence is short and easie. For if *Grotius* were really a *Roman* Catholick, he was reconciled to that Church, either 1. *before,* or 2. *at* his death, (for *after*

after his death, you have onely reconciled him in your opinion, without his knowledge or consent,) or 3. at least he thought himself obliged to *call* (at his death) for such a reconciliation; and so, *voto saltem*, at least in *wish* or *desire*, (that is, as much as in him lay) to *seek* the peace of that Church from which he had lived so long *divided*. Not the first, for then he never would have *received* the *Lutheran* Minister as he *did*; much lesse (as he *did*) have purposely *sent* for him. Not the *second*, nor the *third*; for then Doctor *Quistorp's Testimonial* had told us *which*, and had put the whole matter without *dispute*. I shall once more mind you of Doctor *Owen's pretensions*, that *Grotius* was a *Socinian*; because I since find him *disowning* the jealousie of *Grotius* his being a *Papist*, at least the *management* of any such thing. If these *pretensions* have truth in them, *Grotius* his *ghost* is delivered from *Popery*. If they have no truth at all, you must answer to Doctor *Owen* your having condemned him of *calumny*, which to do, you confesse, is *an odious thing, a great Crime, such as needeth Repentance and Recantation*. (*Sect.* 1.)

Of Grotius his pretended dissimulation.

Sect. 6. Notwithstanding all this evidence, whereof the far greater part might have been seen by your self before I shew'd it, you have not scrupled in your *Preface* to proceed as followeth, viz. [*That you join with me in charity to* Grotius; in that you *vindicate him from dissimulation, as I from Popery*, *Sect.* 2.]

Is this then your *charity*, to call *him Papist* who was so certainly *none*? to offer proofs for it by such *concluding* Arguments, as those must needs be which are brought against this *evidence* in point of *Fact*? and then to say, that you *vindicate* him from *dissimulation*? I pray Sir tell me, do you take those men for your own *Assertors* and *Hyperaspiste*, who in their books *against you* have cited passages out of your writings whereby to conclude you an *Arminian*, yea a *Socinian*, perhaps a *Jesuite* sometimes, I am sure a *Papist*, and of the *worst sort of* Papists (which are the Jesuits) when you professe you are *neither*? Can those your Adversaries and Brethren be said to have *vindicated* your

your person from *dissimulation*, who are as known a *Presbyterian* as any of them? I am bold to give you *that name*, because I think you more *that* then you are any thing *else*; and because you are vulgarly so accounted, though what you are *wholly* I cannot learn. Do you not teach an evil lesson against your self? and will your writing a *Confession of your particular Faith* be able to secure you from *Calumniators*, whilest this method takes place, that he who *calls* an honest man what he professeth *he is not*, doth but *vindicate* and *clear* him from *dissimulation*? I pray bear with me on this occasion, whilest I recount how *others* have dealt with *you*, and then how *you* have dealt with *others*.

You tell us * that "Doctor *Owen took pains about your* "*person, to prove from your writings you are hypocritically* "*proud, and that he seemed to accuse you of heresie:* * *That* "*in his anatomizing of your pride, he played his after-game* "*more plausibly then they who before had published abun-*"*dance of calumnies of you to the world; telling them not* "*only that you were a* Papist, *but what books they were that* "*made you a* Papist, *and what* Emissaries *you have in all* "*parts of the land.* * *That you and the* Worcester-shire "*Profession of Faith give too much countenance to the So-*"*cinian abominations.* Again † you say, *that the hardest* "*measure you had from Doctor* Owen, *was in his* Socinian-"*Parallel in* (no lesse then) *eleven particulars.* * *That* "*Master* Crandon *hath ans a whole Epistle to tell the Re-*"*der how he detests your BLASPHEMY.* * *And that* "*the main substance of his Book against your Aphorismes* "*is this, That you are a* Papist, *and the worser sort of* "*them too.*

* Disput. 5. of Sacram. p. 484.

* Ibid. p. 486.

* Ibid. p. 487.

† Ibid. p. 487.

* Ibid. p. 516.

* Postscript to an Admonition to Mr. Eyre of Sarum.

Now if such men as these, whom you acknowledge to be your *Brethren*, both *learned* and *judicious*, are not hastily to be *credited* in what they write against *you*, notwithstanding their *number* as well as *quality*; how much *less* may *you* look for credit in what you write against *Grotius*? For first the Advocates for *Grotius* will except against you as his *enemy* (*vel sic de pente dejiciendum*) and so not fit

to

to be a *Witnesse*, much lesse a *Judge*. Next you are but a *single person*. Thirdly, you fasten the name of *Papist* so very wrongfully upon *some*, as if you were willing not to be credited when you cast it upon *others*. For you tell Master *Tombes*, * that *if he hath read all the books of Doctor* Taylor, *he will no more reckon him among the* Protestants, *having so much of the body of* Popery *in them*. But, Sir, if you have read his *Book* of *Transubstantiation*, (which must needs be *one* of the *all* you mention) you will find new matter of *Retractation*. Adde to *that* his *two Letters* which do wholly concern the whole *Body* of *Popery*; and which as soon as you have read, you will not think his Discourses of *Original Sin* can (by their single force) become sufficient to *metamorphise* him into a *shape*, which he doth not onely disclaim *himself*, but enable *others* to disclaim also; and doth antidote *some* against the *contagion* of that *Disease* with which you peremptorily speak him to be *infected*. One thing comes into my minde (upon this occasion) of which I would be glad to have some account. You say in * *one* Book, wherein you speak of *Popish Bishops who lurk under the name of Episcopal, That all their Writings or Discourses do carry on the* Roman *Interest: That in those of them who write of Doctrinals or Devotion, one may find the plain footsteps of common* Popery. (You say) *You are loth to name men, but you could shew a great deal of* Popery *in divers such books which you see much in Gentlemens hands, as written by an Episcopal Doctor*. In contradiction to one important part of which words, [*your being loth to name men*] you do name Doctor *Taylor* in your book above cited. Bishop *Wren* and Bishop *Pierce* you also *name in that Book* in which you professe *you are loth to name* them, as I shall shew by and by. In the mean time I must challenge you (but in the spirit of love and meeknesse) to *make good* your words above written, or to *retract* them. That if *Popish Divines do lie lurking under the name of Episcopal*, they may be *punish'd* for their *Hypocrisie*: Or if it is onely your fiction, that you may make *reparation* for so much *wrong*. For again, † your

* Dispute with Mr. Tombs, of Infants Church-Membership and Baptism, Edit. 3. p. 397. Doctor Taylor no Papist.

* See your Chr. Concord. p. 49. and compare it with p. 46. of the same book, and with p. 100. of your Grotian Relig.

of your charge of *Cassandrian Popery* is indefinitely laid against *Episcopal Divines*, who lie mask'd here in *England* to do the *Pope* the *greater service*. And although you now plead, that *you did not intend to raise a jealousie on all the Episcopal Divines* (p. 103.) yet I believe you intended to raise a jealousie on the *most*, because you feared not to name Bish. *Wren* and Bish. *Pierce*, as a couple of your fancied *Cassandrian Papists*, who yet are known to be as perfect persevering *Protestants*, as *you* to be a *Presbyterian* (if yet I may say you are *truly such*.) And though *you judge it unmeet to name even those who* (you say) *have given you just cause of suspicion, because it may tend to breach of peace, and to the harder censuring and usage of the persons, which* (you say) *is none of your desire*, (p. 100.) yet you have nam'd *too many* (it seems,) *against* your *own judgment*, who gave you *no cause at all*, and have left your Readers to judge by *them* of the *rest*. Nay without exception or discrimination, *you name the Bishops and the Kings Chaplains, and other Doctors*. Admit some *Papists* did *lurk* amongst them, I hope you will argue nothing from thence, but that *themselves* were no *Papists*. For now you openly confesse, *that the Papists are crept in among all sects, the Quakers, Seekers, Anabaptists, Millenaries, Levellers, Independents, yea and the Presbyterians also*, (p. 99, 100.) Nay you farther make a Confession, (for which I commend your ingenuity) that *the* Pope *and the* Italians *might very probably have a considerable hand in raising our wars* (p. 106.) *Nor do you wonder if it be true that the* Papists *did not onely kindle our wars here, and blow the coals on both sides, but also that it was by the* Roman *influence that the late King was put to death*, (p. 108.) When I compare your words with the words of *Salmasius*, I guesse that the *Papists* and *Presbyterians* were both assistants to one another in contriving the *mischieves* of which you spake.

Christ. Concord. p. 45, 46, &c.

Claud. Salm. Defens. Regis, c. 10. & c. 11.

Sect. 7. You say on in your Preface, *that had* Grotius *been living, you think you should have had more thanks from him then I, and that if you understand him, he took it for his glory to be a Member of that Body of which*

Grotius *at last is but a Papist with an If, &c.*

which the Pope *is the Head, even to be a* Roman *Catholick, Sect.* 2.]

Thus it pleaseth you to speak, though without any tolerable shew of truth; not is there any proof offered, but that so *you think*, and *if you understand him*. Its very strange that the *one point* on which your *machine* is wholly founded, (of the *Grotian Religion*, and the *new way* in which the *Prelatists* are involved) to wit *Grotius* his being a *Roman* Catholick, should be thus feebly introduced with an [*I think, and if I understand him.*] An humble begging of the Question were a *gentile* quality to *this*. There is hardly any the *least* of your *baffled Adversaries*, but will be able to say as much in his own defence against your *Aphorismes*; your Adversaries *think*, (or else they speak against their conscience) and *if they understand you*, 'tis thus and thus, you are a *Socinian*, and a *Papist*, and the *worser sort of them too*, as some of your Brethren did *think*, and *if* they did rightly *understand you*. How often therefore are you pleading that they do *misunderstand* you? And against all their misunderstandings, you write a *thick book in quarto* for the *confession of your Faith*. (If the *diseases* had not been *numerous*, I suppose you had been *shorter* in your prescribing the means of *cure*.) *Grotius* his *Ghost* may well make much *shorter work*, even by telling you in a word, that *you knew not his mind*, not *understood* his *designes* in writing *Notes* upon *Cassander*, which were *onely Pacifick*, not *Apostatick*; and so your whole Fabrick is very speedily at an end. And the one remaining Engine whereby to keep up *Presbyterianism*, to wit, the *jealousies* and *fears* of the *deep* Grotian *designe*, (so *deep* indeed, as not to have the *least bottom*) in the very same instant doth *vanish* also.

Popery disclaimed as well by Grotius and Mr P. as by Mr. Baxter.

Sect. 8. You proceed to tell me, *that if any shall gather from your words, my being such my self as you say you manifest* Grotius *to have been, you protest against such accusations, as no part of your intention*. But you say, *I have given too much occasion of them by my vindication, and that 'tis in my power to remove that occasion*,

on, by disowning what in Grotius *I dislike. Sect.3.*]

A fair expedient to conclude this controversie, to allow *Grotius* the same quarter which is given to *me* as his Advocate. If I shall *disown* what you *dislike*, this shall vindicate *me* from being a *Papist*. The like privilege you imply is due to *Grotius*. First for my self, I declare that I am *none*. And if *Grotius* was a *Papist*, then *he* and *I* are of *two Religions*. But secondly for *Grotius*, he hath also *disowned* his being a *Papist*, as well as *you* and *my self*. And that may suffice for his vindication. If you will disown what is disliked by your adverse brethren, you will remove that occasion which they took to call you *Papist* and *Socinian*. But you will say, it is enough that you *disclaim* being *either*. *Grotius* was for an *Union* (so is the Spirit of Peace and Unity) presupposing *a Reformation secundum Canones* in respect of the *Papal power*, and presupposing *a Reformation* of the *form* of *Doctrine* according to *antiquity* and *universal Tradition*, as the best Expositors of Scripture, where Scripture is not *agreed* to expound it self. This is according to the Rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, of all the *Fathers* of the *Church*, and of the late Acute *King* in his Dispute against *Henderson*, who is acknowledged by you to have been *no Papist* (p.105, 106.) though calumniated as *such*, you know by *whom*. And however you are said to have *fought* against him, yet I observe that in this, and some other things, you are *for the King against the Parliament*. But to pursue the thrid of my Discourse; *Grotius* left other things to be reformed and adjusted by *Soveraign Princes*, with the assistance of their *Prelates* in their several Kingdomes. Now he that likes this *Doctrine and Design*, and onely thinks it a happinesse too great for *this Age*, wherein there are on both sides so many *irreconciliabiles*, (to wit, *Jesuits* on *that* side, and *Presbyterians* on *this*) and therefore *appeals to posterity*, (as *Grotius* did) is very far from being a *Papist* in the *common acception* of the word, (as you do easily pretend Sect.2.) much lesse is he such in the *thing it self*. But it is easily foreseen by your *close* of that *Section*, how *you* are *resolved* to understand it.

Mistakes in reading Grotius, *arising from a nescience or hatred of his design.*

Sect. 9. Now for your manifold *mistakes* of *Grotius* his *words* in his *Discussio*, arising chiefly from the *byasse* which had been put upon your *judgment*, (I know not whether by your *nescience*, or over-great *hatred* of his *design*,) and which you urge as so many *arguments* to prove that *Grotius* turn'd *Papist*; I take *such* arguments to be *answered* by the bare *removal* of such *mistakes*. Your *mistakes* are removed by being *proved* to be *mistakes*: and they are *proved* to have been *such*, by the *fifth Section* of *this Chapter*, containing eighteen arguments for a matter of *Fact*, whereof there are *some* so *irrefragable*, that perhaps I may be blamed for adding *others*: and unlesse you say you are *not*, I shall comfortably hope that you *are* convinced. Indeed the writings of *Grotius* would have convinced you of *themselves*, if you had read them *all*, and at *leisure*, and with those necessary *cautions*, or *remembrances*, which the Reverend * Doctor *Hammond* had timely given. Or had you but *weighed* what I had told you touching the nature of an *ἐνύλιον*, or rather of the way conducing to it, in my *ἐνυλιωμένος*, *Ch.* 3. *p.* 92, 93, 94. of which I see you *determined* to take *no notice* (p. 3.) I told you early (would you have mark'd it) that *Grotius* as a *Peace-maker* betwixt the *Papists* and the *Protestants*, had labour'd to shew his moderation as well to *them* as to *these*; and to excuse many things at least *à tanto*, to which he had not afforded his *approbation*. For he who attempted a *Reconcilement* of two great *Enemies*, was not in prudence to declare a personal *enmity* to *either*, but to mitigate the *exceptions* and *animosities* of *both*; and to insist on those things, whether *faulty* or *indifferent*, which he desired might meet with (in either party) an *interchangeable pardon*, and an *interchangeable compliance*. *Melanchthon* (I told you) had done the same, and was accused (as well as *Grotius*) as a *sly friend to Popery*. The same was done by *Thuanus* amongst the *Papists*, who was * accused for his labour of having turned *Protestant*. Indeed his favour to the *Protestants* was so

* *Answ. to Animadv. on the Differt. touching* Ignatius *his Epistles, p.* 135, 136, 137.

* *Jo. Baptista Gallus* obstinatâ vesaniâ pernegat, *Thuanum* Catholicæ fidei tenacissimum & Ecclesiæ *Romanæ* &c. vide *Epist. Anonym. p.* 103. *Tom.* 5. *ad calcem lib.* 6. *Aug. Thuani de vita sua.*

much

much greater then that of *Grotius* and *Melanchthon* unto the *Papists*, that *his* friends of *that* Church, as *their* friends of *this*, were fain to write his *vindication*. He might indeed have been a *Protestant* by the *Confession* of his *Faith* in his *last Will and Testament*, the like to which (I suppose) hath hardly been made by any *Papist*. And whilest you intimate your opinion that *Thuanus* was a *Papist* of a deeper die then either *Cassander* or *Grotius* was, (p. 9.) you infer that *Grotius* was *none at all*; or else the Writings of *Thuanus* are *strangers* to you.

Sect. 10. I find that *rigid Presbyterians* would be at peace with the *Papists*, as the * *Houses* of the *long Parliament* would have made peace with their *King*; to wit, if *he* would comply with *them* in *all things*, and *they* with *him* in *nothing at all*: where as if we make a Διαλλαχτικὸν by mutual Offices of *Friendship*, and not a *Conquest* by acts of *Force*, there must be *Abatements* and *Allowances* on either side. They are not worthy to be imploy'd in making *Amity* or *Union*, who understand not how much 'tis *worth*. There are a great many *truths* of so small importance, that one would part with them *all* for a *dram* of *charity*: and I should think that to *purchase* the *peace* of *Christendom*, no *Protestant* Merchants can *bid* too high, so long as they part not with old *Fundamentals*, nor do accept *new Articles of Faith*, nor acknowledge subjection to a power, which whensoever it pleaseth may do both the one and the other. Now by *your* way of arguing that *Grotius* turn'd *Papist*, because in order to *reconcilement* he offered *allowances* to the *Papists*, which he would not yield upon *other terms*, (as many peaceable Christians will rather part with some petie *rights*, then *perpetuate contention* by sutes at Law,) *Thuanus* also turn'd *Protestant*, and so did *Cassander*, and *Hofmiesterus*, and *hundreds more* whom I could name, who did *offer* at least as much, on the same condition of *reconcilement*, *they* for *that* side, as *he* for *this*. This must therefore be considered by all that read his *pacificatory writings*: and it ought to be esteemed the *noblest submission* in the World, to part with the utmost

How much may be offered to purchase peace.

* See *The Royal Library*, *Sect.* 4. *Num.* 15. *p.*339. *to p.*359. See also the *second part of that Collection*, *p.*465. *to p.* 480. *especially p.*517. *to p.* 526.

Plusquam humanæ virtutis est, tantæ spei moderari, & velut manibus conclusam fortunam dimittere.

of ones *own right*, that may in *conscience* be parted with, for the *redemption* of such a *peace* as cannot otherwise be *purchased*. The victorious Emperour *Charles the fifth* thought good to *quit* some of his *Empire* (not *driven* by necessity, but *drawn* by love) for the setling of *Religion* and *Peace* in *Germany*; so did *Philip* his *Son*, the potent King of *Spain*, and Arch-Duke *Albert* his *son in Law*, make an *humble offer* of reconcilement to the *Hollanders*, which for *fourty years* together they had *denied* them. By *De Ney* the *Franciscan*, by *Lewis Verreich* the *Arch-Dukes Secretary*, and even by *Spinola himself*, with divers others whom *Grotius* * names (as it were *justifying himself* by way of *anticipation*,) they even *supplicated for peace* to their *natural subjects*. The same *Philip the second* did even *buy* reconcilement with *Henry the fourth*, *King of France*, when that *lofty King* would not *bid* any thing *towards* it. Yet *Lewis* his *Son*, (the Duke of *Mantua's* Renitency notwithstanding) gave a portion of *Monferrat* to the Duke of *Savoy*, as a *price* laid down in exchange for *Amity* and *Peace*. Nay the Emperour *Ferdinand the second* was content to *yield* a good part of *Hungary*, and so to purchase *one peace*, though it was but to exclude or break *another*. After all these examples (which do put me in mind of the *Christian-like* Doctrine in † *Hierocles*, however he was a *Heathen*, and writ a Book against *Christ*) let me adde *one more*, which is neerer *home*, and more to my purpose then *all the rest*, and which I shall earnestly recommend to your most serious consideration.

* *Epist. ad Clariss. Virum N. P. de pace Germanica.* Sane in privatis quoque negotiis, transactiones, dato aliquo, & aliquo retento, (ut nostri loquuntur jurisconsulti) perficiuntur: quanto magis, ubi de salute publica & pacis incomparabili bono agitur, omnes de jure suo cedere debent?

† ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τῶν κοινῶν πολιτείας, &c. *Hierocl.* p. 61.

When his Majesty, at the *Treaty* in the *Isle of Wight*, did offer for *three years the confirmation of the Directory*, and the *Form of Church-Government presented to him*, and the *leasing out of the Bishops lands as far as 99. years*, will you say he was turn'd a *Presbyterian*? I know you will not; because they were *offers* upon *condition* of publick

peace,

* *peace*, not *absolute* concessions at all adventure. And *conditio non impleta non obligat fidem*, is a very good rule in the *Civil Law*. Nor did he offer what he thought *best*, precisely consider'd in *it self*, but what he thought to be the *fittest* in that juncture of *time*, when he found himself plac'd 'twixt two *evils*, whereof (in great wisdom) he chose the *least*. For although he offer'd towards the *setling of a peace*, no less then 100000 *pounds*, to be raised out of the *Bishops lands*, yet first it was onely towards the *settlement of a peace*, (and a *little* of *that* is worth *money*;) next it was with a *Proviso*, *That the inheritance and propriety should still continue to the Church*; thirdly, the peace being denied him, he also denied to confirm his *offer* into a *Grant*. Not would he ratifie the *Directory*, no not so much as for a *day*; wch (for the *buying* of *peace*) had else obtain'd for *three years*. But for the *Solemn League and Covenant*, as he neither would *sign* it, or consent to it *himself*, so would he not have it to be imposed upon the consciences of *others*; no, not in order to any ends, whether *personal safety*, or *publick peace*.

* Nec deerunt rationes, quibus pulsis suâ ditione Principibus satisfieri possit, qui magni beneficii loco habebunt, in partem saltem missarum ditionum restitui. Præterea compensationibus & mutuâ permutatione res expediri poterit. *Idem in Epist. eid.*

Potior esse debet suæ salutis, quàm alieni damni, priorque conservandi quàm proferendi Regni ratio. *Ibid.*

This is just the Case of *Grotius*, excepting that it differs to *his advantage*; for he offer'd not so *much*, and he ask'd for *more*. Nay farther yet, if *Grotius* turn'd *Papist* by seeking to reconcile the *Council of Trent* with the *Protestant* Articles of the *Augustan Confession*, then did *Franciscus à Sanctâ Clarâ* (by your Logick) turn *Protestant*, because you * confesse he did endeavour to reconcile the Articles of the *Church of England* with the *Council of Trent*. The absurdity of the consequence is in both cases *alike*. Again, you confesse † a little before, that *Grotius* his *design had many favorites, both of the better sort of* Papists, *and of the colder sort of* Protestants: from whence I gather this comfort, that however I am a *favourer* of *Grotius* his *design*, I am yet allow'd to be a *Protestant*, though one of *them* whom you call the *colder party*; that is to say, (as I interpret) I am none of those *hot-headed furious men*, who not

* *Christ. Concord. p. 46.*

† *Ibid. p. 45.*

not understanding what spirit they are of (on supposition that they are *Christians*) are for *fire from heaven* (if not from hell too) upon all that are not of their *persuasion*. But as your *better* sort of *Papists* are sure the *colder*, so your *colder* sort of *Protestants* are sure the *better*, (it being clear, that by the *colder* you mean the *more moderate*:) and it is much for their honour, that they are *lovers* of *Reconcilement* the most of *any*.

Grotius his Doctrine and Design more Catholical then Mr. Baxter's.

Sect. 11. You object against *Grotius*, *That he was not truly Catholick in his designs and Doctrines* (p.11.)

Yet he excluded not *any*, but onely said who they were that would not indure to be *included*. He knew that *some* peace was better then *no* peace at all. And shall not parties of *moderation* seek an agreement with one another, because they cannot agree with the *two Extremes*? Can you name any one person whom he forbad to accept of the terms propos'd? Or is an *offer* the lesse Catholick, for being made upon conditions to every Creature? You cannot say this, who are for *Catholick Redemption*: or when you write your self *Catholick*, and set forth terms of *Christian Concord*, can you imagine that *your* design is *half* so Catholick as *his*? I cannot imagin that you can. You indeed will be at unity with all the World, if all the World will agree with your *Worcestershire combination*. But so the *World* will be at *Unity*, if all will embrace the *design* of *Grotius*; nay all the World had been at *Unity* if all had agreed with *John* of *Leyden*. *Sed nihil hoc ad* Iphicli *boves*. And what you say against *Grotius*, is *gratis dictum*.

And the terms to which he calls us, lest impossible.

Sect. 12. But you stick not to affirm, *that* Grotius *calls us all to impossible terms of unity, as the onely terms*, (p.12.) *every whit as impossible as a medicine from the Moon, or the Antipodes, or the brains of a Phœnix to cure a Patient*, p.13.]

1. You seem to forget what you had said *at another time*, to wit, that *Grotius* was a man not of *great reading onely, and much learning*, but that he had also *a* "*mighty judgment to improve it*. Nay that *you take him for so learned and so judicious a man, as you do not judge your self worthy*

" Christ. Conc. p.45.

thy in any such respect to be named with him, p.4. Now whether it suits with a man of *judgment* to prescribe a *medicine* from the *Moon*, or what is *equally impossible*, and to spend so *many years* in it, as *Grotius* professeth to have done, I shall onely leave to your *future consideration*.

2. You are unmindful of the *parties* to whom the terms of peace were more immediately propounded; even the *moderate Papists*, who were of the temper of *Thuanus*, and the *moderate Protestants*, who were of the temper of good *Melanchthon*: not the *rigidest* of the *Papists*, who were wholly devoted unto the *Papacy*; nor the *rigidest* of the *Protestants* who perfectly doat on the *Presbyterie*: and yet the onely way imaginable whereby to draw them to *moderation*, were for those that are moderate to *allure* them to it by their *example*. For *whom* was it *possible* to agree, if not for the *soberest* of either party? nay for whom was it *probable*, if not for them who *desir'd* it with so much *fervour*?

3. You little think how *many*, or how *important* persons there have been, who having the same *aimes* with *Grotius*, and having used the same *indeavours*, have expected to reap some better fruit, then meerly their *labour* for their *pains*, even *Emperours*, *Kings*, *Cardinals*, *Bishops*, and divers others as *wise personages* as the Christian world hath lately had, and as well of the *Protestant* as *Roman* party. The words of *Zanchy* are worth observing, *What can be more to be desired by every man that fears God, then that we live and die in that Church* (meaning the *Roman*, of which *alone* he there speaks) *wherein by Baptism we were born again?* yet he was *then* no *Papist*, but onely a *moderate Presbyterian*.

De Ecclesia Romana jamtum locutus, Quid (inquit Zanchius) pio cuique optatius, quàm ut ubi per baptismum renati sumus, ibi etiam in finem usque vivamus? &c. *In Confess. Art.* 19. p. 157.

4. "You professe *not to distaste the pacificatory desires* "*or designs of* Grotius, (p.6.) how much soever you *ac*"*cuse* them, (p.15,16,17,18.) And you say, *You are a per*"*son of so little worth or interest, that you cannot in reason* "*expect*

"*expect that your endeavours in such a work should have* "*any considerable success. But yet that you will speak* "*and write for peace, though you saw not a man in the* "*World that would regard it, or return you any better thanks* "*then a Reproch*, p.6. Allow to *Grotius* the same zeal, who was a man of great *worth*, and great *interest* in the world, knew (better then you) *what peace* was best, and *which* were the *best ways* to gain it, & was regarded for what he did by the *best men* in the World, however reproched by the most *envious*. You have a confident † saying of your own project, to make up the breaches which have been betwixt the *Lutherans and Calvinists, the Jesuits and the Dominicans, &c.* [That *if your Principles propounded shall have an impartial Reception according to their evidence, you will give us security to make good your confidence, that they shall quiet the Christian World hereabouts.*] When you have *thus* set forth *your self*, you should permit me with patience to speak as highly for *Grotius* too.

† *Preface to Disp. of Sacram.* p.15.

5. But I desire you in special to make reflexion upon a Passage you have printed in your debate with Master *Tombes*: where having said, in the *Defence* and *Commendation* of *Erastus*, * *That he was a very learned judicious man in Divinity, Philosophy and Physick*, and having justified *his medling without the sphere of his own calling in the business of Divinity*, and having also said of him, that *some of his book is erroneous, his arguments very weak for mixt communion, and that he seemeth oft to contradict what he there pleadeth for*; you proceed in these words, which seem to me very remarkable:

* *Plain Script. proof of Infants Church-Memb. and Baptism*, p.127, 128.

"*For my part, (were my judgment of any moment* "*to others) after my serious study in this point, both in Scri-* "*pture and Antiquity, (specially the Writers of the three* "*first Centuries) I am confidently persuaded that the true* "*way of Christs Discipline* is parcell'd out between the "*Episcopal, Erastian, Presbyterian and Independents, and* "*that every party hath a piece of the Truth in peculiar—* "*And I verily think that if every one of the four parties* "*do entirely establish their own way, they will not establish the* "*Scripture-way.*] Ibid.

These

These are all your own words: and to these you adde more, [*That let it be taken how it will, you will acquaint the world with your thoughts of this also, if God will so long draw out your life.*] But if you put forth such a *work*, you will quickly find your self *more*. No *Ismael* had ever more hands against him, for your hand will be against *all*. And may not your *medicine from the Moon with the bruise of a Phœnix*, be applied by *me* against *your* attempt, as well as *you* have applied it to that of *Grotius*? Such a design as this is, would make the unity and peace of the Church seem impossible, and our Divisions desperate. *Turpe est Doctori, quem culpa redarguit ipsum.* It should seem by this, that in your judgment the *true discipline of Christ* hath been *revealed* onely to *you*, or at least, that *you* onely have found it out by your *industry*. Nor are you onely a *Presbyterian*, but an *Episcopal Divine*, an *Erastian* also, and *Independent*; or if you are not *all*, you are *neither*. Nor indeed can you be *either* in point of Discipline, unless you are professedly *against the Scripture*. When you say you *would cleave to any party that you could perceive were in the right*, (p. 24.) you do but say in effect, that *you cleave to none*, you having declared your belief, that *none of those twire mayes is the Scripture-way*. But why was a National *League and Covenant* both *sworn* and *fought* for? and *persecutions* made use of, for *non-conformity* to the Covenant? Why were men so expensive of *Blood* and *Conscience* for the pulling down of *Episcopacy* so well established, and for the setting up of a *Scottish Presbytery* in the room, if the *former* was *partly*, and the *latter but partly* the way of *Christ's discipline*? May not the *Independents* and the *Erastians* do as much against *Presbyterie*, as *Presbyterians* have done against the *Prelacy* of the *Church*, and cite *your* judgment, as one defensative of their *own*? Of all the Ministers in the land, the *Presbyterians* who were Preachers within the Province of *London A. D.* 1647. and * protested so much against *all toleration*, which did not well comport with their *solemne League and Covenant*, *Christ*; and compare it with the *Covenant*, as well as with the *interest* for *Toleration*, will

* See the book intitled, *A Plea for Bishops, to the Tribunal of Jesus Christ*, &c.

will least of all thank you for your discovery. 'Tis true, you have also your *Pacifick Design*: but so little hath it of *Catholicism*, and so *impossible* it is to prove effectual, that (after your having *accused Grotius*) it onely serves to make you fall under your *own condemnation*. When you say that *Christ*'s and the *Scripture way is parcell d out between four parties, and that every party hath a piece of the truth in peculiar*, (that is to say, not common to it with any *one* of the other *three*) and so that *the whole* of the *Truth* must be *compounded* of four *Ingredients*; some of your readers will reflect on the *conceit* of *Tamerlane*, that *Religion* ought to be like a *Posie*, which smells *best*, when made up of the *most variety*. And I have read that *Mahomet* (of the Tribe of *Ishmael*) thought fit to make up his *new Religion*, by borrowing (and blending with his Inventions) one parcel from the *Pagans*, another from the *Jews*, a third from the *Arians*, a fourth from the *Nestorians*, a fifth from the *Manichees*, that so he might (with the greater ease) *reconcile* them all unto *himself*. And (with pardon to the *comparison*, which is not intended to *run on four feet*) if in the *Medlie* which you propose, the component parts will so *temper* and *correct* each other, that the *whole* will be grateful to *every party*, you will not onely grow *famous* as the *first Discoverer* of the *thing*, but (nature being thus changed and tamed) our *Lambs* will dwell safely within the neighbourhood of the *Wolf*, and the *Leopard* inoffensively lie down with the *Kid*. You who have given in your *Tuqua* after *serious study of the point, both in Antiquity and the Scriptures*, may speak *unexpectedly* in your *account*. But you have left *me* to wonder, (and I suppose some *thousands* more) which ingredient of the *four* shall be *predominant* in the *mixture*, or which shall be the *Basis* of all the *structure*, so as to give satisfaction to *every party*; or whether in the *mixture* all parts can be *equal*, and a *Structure* erected without a *Basis*. If four distinct parties have the *Truth* of *Christ's Discipline* divided betwixt them, unlesse it be *equally* divided, they will not all own an *equal right* to the inheritance on *every side*. Else when

Celrenus p. 347. Baronius ad A.D. 619, 630.

when the *Presbyterian Ministers* were so hard put to it by his * *Majesty* at the *Isle of Wight*, to give in their Answer to these Queres, 1. *Whether there be a certain Form of Government left by Christ or his Apostles to be observed by all Christian Churches*; 2. *Whether it bind perpetually, or be upon occasion alterable in whole, or in part*; 3. *Whether that certain form of Government be the Episcopal, Presbyterian, or some other differing from them both*, (and we know how shamefully they did again and again decline answering the Queres, though they confessed them to be of great importance) your *quadri-partite way* might have serv'd their turn, had it not been for their usual boast, that since the times of Christianity their *own* is the *onely Divine Model in the World*. To the glory of which *priviledge* the *Episcopal* party laying claim, with fairer reasons for their pretension, how will you do for the share of the *other two*, (the *Independent* and the *Erastian*) and reconcile Extremes of so great a distance? If I say not (in civility) that the terms imply a contradiction; yet I know there are of your *Presbyterians* who will say that the *mention* of *such terms* doth carry in the *Forehead* its own *confusion*.

* See Reliquiæ sacræ Carolinæ, in the Papers which passed &c. at Newport, p. 275, & 367, 368, 369.

Sect. 13. Your following reasons of dislike (from *p.* 15. to *p.* 19.) are at least as feeble as your *two first*, they having nothing to support them but your particular *wants* of *apprehension*, if not the *strength* of your *prejudice* against *Grotius* his Doctrine and Design. For first when you say, that *in the name of a peace-maker he divideth and cutteth off the holiest parts of the Church on earth*, (p. 15, 16.) it is *gratis dictum*, without so much as a *shew* of *proof*; and a pitiful *begging* of the *Question*, which no man living will *grant* you, who is not partially addicted to all you say. You fitly confesse (in a *Parenthesis*) you do but *speak your own judgment*. And what is *your judgment* compar'd with that of immortal *Grotius*, who knowingly judged those men to be the greatest *subverters* of *Church* and *State*, (and that *incessantly* by their *Principles*, as well as *frequently* by their *Practice*, even as often as they have *power* to reduce their Principles into Practice,) whom you af-

Grotius *doth not cut off the holiest parts of the Church.*

firm without *scruple*, as without *colour* of *excuse*, to be the *holiest part of the Church on earth?* What you say, and *but say*, of my *reproching Puritans throughout my book*, (very politickly forbearing to cite so much as one page or passage) doth not belong to this place, and shall be duly spoken of in a peculiar Chapter. And when you tell me that *Grotius doth make the name of the Reformed or Protestants a note of reproch, to those that will not be reconciled to the Pope*, you do not onely beg the Question, and speak without an offer of reason for it, but as contrary to truth, as if you had *affected* its *opposition*. For I have made it appear, that he did *honour* the name of *Protestant*, and reckoned *himself* with the *Reformed*. But he noted with a *black coal*, those *rebellious Schismaticks* in the *Protestant* Churches, (if yet I may so speak without implying a contradiction, for they cease to be of *our Church*, by their separating themselves from *our Communion*) who usurp'd the title of the *Reformed*, and help'd to *justifie the Papists* in all their *clamours*, by still pretending to be *Reformers* of our most excellent *Reformation*. I can prove (by your own Logick) that *you* your self are a reviler of the *Protestant name*, by throwing such *Cart-loads* of *dirt* upon the *Regular Sons* of the *Church of England*, who will ever be esteemed (do what you can) the most *judiciously reformed* of all the *Protestants* in the World. Again you dishonour the *Protestant name*, by calling the *irreconciliables*, the *holiest men*; and by pleading so much for *Puritans* (as the godliest part of the *Protestants*) who call a *Rebellion*, a *Reformation*, and stick the term of *Christian purity* on the most *palpable hypocrisie* to be imagined. For these alone are the *Puritans* whom both *Grotius*, and Bishop *Andrews*, Bishop *Hall*, and Doctor *Sanderson*, and indeed the most renowned of all the *Protestants* in the World have taught us to *know*, and to *avoid*, under that very name. And therefore let me intreat you to be so *just* for the future, (even to those whom you are pleased to single out for your Adversaries) as to suffer their *own words* to be the interpreters of their *own meaning*.

Sect. 14.

Sect. 14. The next reason of your dislike (*p.* 16.) is but an *uncharitable Assertion* (without so much as *pretending* to any *proof*) that *Grotius his way was uncharitable, and a trap to ingage the souls of millions in the same.* But they that read and understand him do know the contrary, that *Peace*, and *Loyalty*, and *Obedience*, and *mutual Love*, were all the traps wherein *Grotius* would very fain have engaged the souls of men. You think not so ill of *his* design, as your *Fathers* and *Superiours* do think of *yours*: yet it lay in your power, you would engage the souls of *millions* in it. And if *you* may be so zealous in *your* contrivance, much more may *Grotius* be allow'd to have been in *his*; you having confessed *you are not worthy to be so much as nam'd with him*, and *that a small measure of humility may make you serious in your profession*, p. 4. And if you fall so very *short* both of his *learning* and of his *judgment*, take *my* word you fall *shorter* of his *integrity* of *life*, if you will but allow me to take your *own*. And I shall cite your own words in their proper place.

His way is not uncharitable.

Sect. 15. As your fourth reason (so called) was the same in substance with your third, so now your fifth (if not your sixth) is the same in substance with the two former. As affirming a *tendency in the design of* Grotius *to engage the Princes of Christendom in a persecution of their subjects that cannot comply with these unwarrantable terms*, p. 17. In this you say no more of *Grotius*, then any man living may say of *you*, or indeed of *any man living*. But as you nakedly say it, with a great deal of *confidence* in stead of *reason*, so is it *known* to all the World, to whom the *meekness* of *Grotius* is not utterly *unknown*, that he was as far from such a *project* as he was from being a *Presbyterian*. If to hinder *subjects* from treading all under their feet, (as well their *Soveraigns*, as *fellow subjects*,) must passe with *you* for a *persecution*, then was *Grotius* as guilty as you expresse him; for he indeed exhorted Princes to *beware* of those *Ministers* who *taught* the people to be *rebellious*, and to call it by the fine title of *setting Christ upon his Throne*. He would not have *Sacrilege*, and *Murder*, and all manner of

It doth not tend to persecution.

of *Rapine*, to be freely exercised and used as the proper *means* of *Reformation*. He could not indure that the filthiest *fruits* of the *flesh* should be ascribed to the *suggestions* of Gods good *Spirit*. And if men are grown to such a pitch of impiety, as not to be satisfied with less then with a liberty of Conscience to *cut* mens *throats*, they ought not to call it a *persecution*, to be happily bound to some *good behaviour*. What you adde of the *attempts of pride, when men have such high thoughts of their own imaginations and devices, that they think the Churches wounds can be healed by no other plaister, but by this of their compounding*, (p. 17, 18.) is so unduly appli'd to *Grotius*, that it hath many *reflexions* upon *your self*; for you know you have been a great *promisser* in your dayes. You mislike the Plaister proposed by *Grotius*, and that of some *late Episcopal Divines*, which yet you prefer before that of *Grotius* (p.21.) you mislike the Plaister of Bishop *Bramhal*, (p.22, 25.) and indeed what is there, which (in *other men*) you do not publickly *dislike*? But you like your *own Plaister*, as abundantly sufficient to *heal* the *wounds* of the *Church*; at least, as *better* then other mens. It appears by what I have cited from you in the *twelfth Section of this Chapter*, and by what you said in your Preface to your book of *Sacraments*, and by what you now say in your *Grotian Religion*, (p.29.) that though the *Tongue is a little member*, yet it *boasteth great things*.

Jam.3.5.

It doth not engage in a way of sin.

Sect.16. You say the *sixth reason of your dislike of* Grotius *his Pacification, and all such as his, is because it engageth the Church of Christ in a way of sin, both in false Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship*, p.18.) still a *confident affirmer* of what your interest or your passion suggesteth to you, without the appearance of any ground excepting your *absolute Decree* to reprobate *Grotius* and his Design. But 'tis enough that I *deny*, what you think it enough but to *affirm*; and do know that *Grotius* his *Pacification* was as much *superiour* unto your *own*, (in all imaginable respects) as *you* and your *Writings* are confessedly *inferiour* to *him* and *his*. A little while since you were professing, that *you distaste*

not

not Grotius *his Pacificatory designs, and that if you could find such a heart within you, you would cast it in the dust, and condemn it to shame, and sorrow, and recantation;* (p.18.) yet now you say in plain terms, that *you dislike his pacification* (p.18.) nay you *vehemently* dislike it, as appears by the *enormities* with which you *charge* it. It was the *Motto* of King *James*, who had it out of *Christ's School*, *Beati pacifici*, *Blessed are the Peace-makers*. And therefore *Grotius*, as a *pacifick*, was much esteemed by that King. Nor can he be one of *Christ's family* who doth not love *Pacification*. But if by that word you mean his *Pacificatory design*, how came you to *dislike* (at your *eighteenth page*) what (but *twelve pages before*) you highly *liked*? If you say you distinguish his particular *way* from his *design*, it seems your quarrel is onely this, that having chosen a *good end*, he did not jump with *your humour* in chusing the *means* of its *attainment*. But methinks for *this* you should never have *us'd* him as you have done, because he knew not you were an *Oracle*, and so he could not *consult* you concerning the course he was to take. You do avow *your approbation of Pacificatory attempts between us and the Papists*, p.30. where then lay the fault, when *Grotius attempted such a pacification* with the greatest *Industry* and *Wisdom* that God had given him? Had *you* been as *Grotius* in point of *power* and *prudence*, (to say no more) you would have taken *his* course; and so if *Grotius* had been as *you*, he would no doubt have taken *yours*. But *Grotius* being as he *was*, one of the *wisest* and most *learned* of all mankind, and you continuing as you *are*, neither the wisest, nor the most learned, what matter of wonder can it be, if he was otherwise advis'd then you would have him? If you do really *take* Grotius *to have been so learned and so judicious* as you express, (p.4.) and do as really *judge your self unworthy to be named with him*, as in the page I now cited you have acknowledged; methinks it is pity that your whole Book should be little else then a preferring your *opinion* before his *judgment*, your *jealousies and fears* before his *knowledge*, and your fortuitous *conjectures* before his *exact*

deli-

deliberations. Whereas you add, *that you abhor their disposition who can despise or violate the Churches Peace for every pety conceit of their own, which they have called by the name of Truth or Duty,* (p.19.) you oblige your self and your party to do some very severe penance for having violated the *Peace* of the *Church of England*, which for so many happy years had been establish'd. The *Presbyterian* way of *Discipline* was a *pety conceit of their own*, as you at least must acknowledge, who have written against it, as hath been * *shewed.* The *Common-Prayer book* (you † confess) was *more perfect then the Directory*, which was therefore another of the *pety conceits*, for which the *peace of the Church was despised and violated.* Nay you complain to * Mr. *Tombs*, that *plain duties were wiped out, and excellent things taken from us, which we were in actual possession of.* Your *National-Covenant* it self you must acknowledge was a *pety conceit of your own*, for which *you have cause to repent*, if we may credit your † *own words.* Why then did you violate the Churches peace? or if you *abhor your self* for it, why do you not make us some *satisfaction?* You are often an admirer of Bishop *Davenant*, who had told you all in good time, * that rather then *have troubled the peace* and *quiet* of the *Church* under which you lived in *subjection*, and of which you did profess you all were *members*, you should quietly have *departed* into some *other Church*, to which you could have been pleased to yield *obedience*, or have remained in *ours* without *disturbance.* Nay this (said the Bishop) you should have done, *tho gh you had thought your opinions had been of such moment, as that salvation in self depended on them.* How much more should you have done it, when the things you stood u on so stiffly were *pety conceits of your own*, and *confessed* such at *long running*, however magnified at your *first setting out?* I ever applauded those *dissenting* and *dissatisfied* brethren, who *peaceably* went into *New-England* and other parts of *America*, until I was taught that they intended a very *unpeaceable return.* Be not angry at your *Master*, but meekly receive the *admonition*, not at all for *my* sake, but

* Look back on Sect. 12.
† Look on what shall be said ch.6.sect.9. num.1.
* Of Inf. ch. memb. and Bapt. p.122,123.
† Ibid. p.123.
* Sent. Deven. ad Duræum, p. 39. & Assert. ad Par. Eccl. cap.11.p.148, 149.

Bishop

Bishop *Davenant's*. And if according to your *own Doctrine*, *Truth* ought to be *suspended* for love of *peace*, then be not offended with this consequence, that you must judge the way of *Grotius* or Bishop *Bramhall* very much worthier to be followed then your own or Mr. *Chillingworths* (p.29.) in case they are likelier to take effect. This I say you *must* do, unless you can give some better reason then I am able to expect for your refusal.

*Sect.*17. Now that you see what you have gotten by the *six Reasons* of your *Dislike*, (for *such* it was in your power to *call* them, though not in power to *make* them *such*,) be pleas'd to reflect on your profession (p.9.) that [*your thoughts of* Grotius *are not either bitter, censorious, or uncharitable.*] In which profession if there is Truth, why would you *write* what you never *thought*? Did you think it was enough to *think well* of the man, whilest you *spake* as *ill* of him as it was possible for you to speak? If your *expressions* are so *bitter* when you are full of *sweet thoughts*, I wonder what *words* you could have us'd in case your *thoughts* had been *bitter* too. Or what advantage could you aim at, in pouring out so many *bitter censorious words*, and in professing at the same time a *contrariety* of your *thoughts*?

Men thoughts of Grotius *must be esteemed by their words.*

Ἐχθρὸς γὰρ μοι κἠκεῖνος ὅμως ἀΐδαο πυλῆσιν
Ὃς κ' ἕτερον κρύψῃ κεύθεϊ ἐν φρεσὶ, ἄλλο δὲ βάζῃ.

But perhaps you may deny that there is *bitterness* in your *words*, and therefore *that* shall be *tried* before I leave you. If you *forget* what is *past*, it will be good for your *memory* to look *before* you.

*Sect.*18. For now I hasten to conclude my *Vindication* of *Grotius*. And I hasten so much the rather, because I hear it will be done in an *elaborate* manner, and *ex professo*, by a great admirer of his perfections, and because I hope I have said enough to make you *sensible* of your *mistake*. For methinks you should not take leasure in trying to make men believe that the *learnedst* of *mortalls* at last turnd *Papist*; or (in case that that is too *bold* a word) one so richly accomplished with all variety of *secular* and *sacred knowledge*, joyned to *wonderful endowments* of *Grace* and

The conclusion.

Nature, but for nothing more remarkable, then *acutenesse* of *research*, and *depth* of *judgement*. Now that a person of such importance should in the full *maturity* of all these *excellencies* forsake the *Protestant Religion* in exchange for the *Papist*, would be a greater advantage to our adversaries then I am willing to afford them, and I heartily wish you had not done it. For the *Roman* Catholicks are too apt to take such honours unto themselves when they can find the least *ground* or *occasion* for them. Had *Grotius* really been a *Papist*, how many *Protestants* had we *lost* by the powerful *attractive* of his *example*? Nay if Mr. *Crandon* and others durst call you *Papist*, and *one of the worst sort of Papists*, even before you contended for *Grotius* his turning from *us* to *Rome*, how much more will they call you *such*, if you shall possibly persist (as you have begun) to do the *Papists* so great a *service*? I do assure you for my self, that if it lay in my power to prove an *Apostasie* of *Grotius* from *us* to *Rome*, although the *Pope* should reward it with a Cardinal's Cap, I would not yield the Church of *Rome* so great *advantage*: so great is my love to the Church of *England*. I know it is not your meaning to serve and gratifie the *Romanists*, because you speak as *ill* of *Grotius* as if he were not worth *having*. You say he was * "*exasperated by his imprisonment*, &c. That *he was too much* † *guilty of uncharitable censures*; That *he was a* * *Dissembler*, "*if not a Papist*; (a) That *he drops into a deplorable Schism*; "(b) That *his way is uncharitable and censorious, wounded* "*under pretense of healing, in the name of a Peace-maker* "*he divideth and cuts off the holiest parts of the Church on* "*earth*; (c) That *his Design is a Trap to tempt and engage the souls of millions into the same uncharitable, censorious, and reprochful way*; (d) That *it tendeth to engage the Princes of Christendom in a persecution of their* "*subjects that cannot comply with uncharitable terms*; "(e) That *this is the unhappy issue of the attempts of pride*, "*when they have such high thoughts of their own devices*, "*and depart from the word of God and the simplicity of* "*the Faith*; (f) That *his Design engageth the Church of Christ*

* Christ. Cont. p.45.
† Grot. Relig. Pref. Stil. 5.
* Ibid. Stil. 2.
a p.11.
b p.15,16.
c p.16.
d p.17.
e p.17,18.
f p.18.

"*Christ in a way of sin, both in false Doctrine, Discipline,*
"*and Worship.* (g) (You imply that he calumniated the g p. 73.
"Patriarch *Cyril.*) You say of him expresly, (h) That *the* h p. 78.
"*injustice and partiality shews the meaning of the man;*
"(i) That *his Design was Schismatical, Partial, and Cruel;* i p. 83.
"(k) That *you dare boldly say, he was an unjust man,* &c. k p. 90.
"*putting a more odious vizor on the face of the* Calvinists
"*Doctrines of Faith, Justification, &c. then beseemeth any*
"*judicious man that understood the state of the Controver-*
"*sies, or the strength of an Argument, and had any Chri-*
"*stian charity left.* (l) You reproch him further, with l p. 91.
"*falshood and abomination of inhumane calumnies; with too*
"*high an esteem of his espoused conceits, and too odious thoughts*
"*of the contrary way;* (m) *with noise and bitter accusation* m p. 91.
"*poured out against the Reformed Churches; with censures*
"*running upon meer mistake, and odiously aggravating the*
"*opinions that deserve it not, and that were far nearer his*
"*own then he imagined;* (n) *with bitter censures, repro-* n p. 92, 93.
"*ches, clamours, and a factious uncharitable way of pacifi-*
"*cation.* Again you say (o) *he is guilty of his own mistakes,* o p. 93.
"*upon which he changed his Church and Religion.*

Thus you speak of that *holy* and *learned man*, in such a strange and amazing strain, that Mr. *Hickman himself* could hardly have used a greater *virulence*. And yet you pretend great *honour* to him, yea a debt of * *Gratitude which* * p. 4.
you owe him for the great benefit of his works. † Yea, that † p. 5.
if you might be partial for any man, it were very likely to be for Grotius. Leaving your readers to imagine how *vile a creature* that man must be, of whom his very *partial* and *obliged* and *thankful* Client (or Disciple) was forced to publish such *ugly things*. And as if this were not sufficient, you say *you ever stopt your ears against the accusation of the blemishes commonly reported of his life, in some points, and suspended your censures of him.* (p. 5.) By which *unchristian Paralipsis* you leave your Readers to imagine that he was a very *scandalous ungodly liver*, which is accounted by some the very worst way of slandering, where notoreity of Fact doth not excuse it. I therefore shall an-

tidote your Readers (if they are mine) with this short Declaration, That by all I have been able to learn of *Grotius*, (either from *other* mens writings, or from his *own*, or from those excellent persons who had many years enjoyed a *friendship* with him,) I cannot but value his *godly life* by many degrees *above* his *learning*.

You have done your self a *shrewder turn* then I could possibly have wish'd you, by writing so bitterly of so *good*, & so *great* a Christian. And though I hope you will acknowledge that I oppose you (in his defence) without distemper; yet do I heartily wish you had not writ against *him*, that so I might not have been obliged thus to write against *you*. That *Grotius* may be *defended*, you will not deny, having defended him * *your self* against the attempts of a modern Doctor. And as *you* have defended him in *one* case, I have *but defended* him in *another*.

* *Append. to Apbor. p.138. to p.145.*

CHAP. II.

An acknowledgment of charity.

*Sect.*1. YOu very readily acknowledge ["*my brotherly* "*and moderate dealing with your self*, and you "say, *you must acknowledge my gentleness and charity*, Sect.4.] I am glad my charity, gentleness, and moderation were so *conspicuous* in my Writings that you could not but *see* them; and so *undeniable*, that you could not but *acknowledge* them to all the World, even at that very time too, when you made it apparent how *willing* you were to *find faults*. For you accuse me (in the same breath) of wanting charity *to others*, and of making my *learning subservient to partial interest or passion*. But you name not *where*, or *when*, or *wherein*, or towards *whom*, I had shew'd such *passion* or *partiality*; which had you been able to have done, I am forbid to believe you would have *spur'd* me. If I was *partial* to *you*, Sir, by being more *brotherly*, more *moderate*, more *charitable* and *gentle*, then you seem to your self to have *deserved*, you ought in all reason to have * *forgiven me this wrong*. Had others deserved

* 2 Cor.12.13.

no

no *worse* of me then your self had then done, my *gentle dealing* with *others* had been as *signal*. And had you been either as *slanderous* or as *blasphemous* as others were, the ex rcisions of my dislike had been as freely distributed unto your self as to any others with whom I dealt. I must not be unwilling to clear mine *own innocence* (as to the calumnies cast upon me) much less to clear *God* from the *evil reports* brought up against him, for fear the *friends* of the *malefactors* should accuse me (as you have done) of *partial interest* and *passion*.

Sect. 2. Nor did you onely say this, but proceeded to the *worst* that could be said, even to censure me as a person in a *state of damnation*, and somewhat *worse* then so too; (that is to say) in a *worse state of damnation then* David *was in before* Nathan *spake to him*; Sect. 20.] Before *Nathan* spake to him, he was in a *state of impenitency*; and why should you *rather chuse to die in such a state, a murderer, adulterer, and an hypocrite*, and *impenitently such*, (at that time) then in the state that *I am in*, whom you confess to have committed *no such sin*, (sect. 20.) if you did not think me to be a *Reprobate*? for if I am one of the *elect* as well as *David*, I shall also *repent* as *undoubtedly* as *David*, let my sins be what they can be. Do you think my *greatest sin* is this, that I am *not guilty* of such sins as *David's*? or that *Adultery* and *Murder* are qualifications for a *Saint*? I pray examine your own heart, and be jealous over your self; and say, *if my charity towards you* (which you acknowledge under your hand) did deserve a *requital* to *void of charity*. I assure you, that by this and some other passages in your book, you have been heavily *censur'd*, even by many of *your way*; and utterly *lost their* good opinion who once *admir'd* you. If you continue to write *much*, and *so* to write as you have done, no man living will have *need* to write against you. As for your *bitterness* to *me* (in this and some other places) I am no more concernad in it, then I ought to be for *your sake*, and do most earnestly pray, *That it may never be laid unto your charge*. It is not the least of my comforts, (for

When uncharitable requital.

Acts 7. 60.

(for they are many) that, when I pray for the repentance of you and others, (by whom I have been *most unkindly judged*,) I do not pray without *Faith*, or without *sincerity*: & though I desire you *not to judge, that you may not be judged*; yet judge the *worst* of *me* you *can*, I will judge of *you* the *best* I *may*.

*Luk.6.37. Mat.7.1. 1 Cor.4.5.

You say [*I seem, as* Grotius, *to be too much affected to my opinions, commonly called* Arminian, *and too much imbitter'd against other mens*, Sect.5.]

The title of Arminian unreasonably applied.

*Sect.*3. Indeed I was told you meant *me*, when you flung a side-cast at the *Northamptonshire Arminian* in your voluminous book of *Disputations*. And though I would not sustain a double person, by *taking* an offence where *none* was *given*; yet *now* I conjecture you did really *strike* at me by that expression, although you fortun'd to *hit* your *self*. That I am *affected to my opinions, as* Grotius *was*, who was so eminent an example both of *Judgment*, and *Piety*, and *Impartiality*, is by much a greater *advantage* to me, then I could ever have pretended to have deserv'd. And therefore for *this*, I thank your *bounty*. How you *your self* have been *affected* to the very *same Doctrines* which are as commonly called *Arminian* also, not a few of *your party* have made us know by their *censures*; for which you gave them as just occasion, as either *Grotius* or I have ever given. Will you own the opinions of *Cameron, Amyrald*, and learned *Daille*? If you say *no*, it will be at your peril. I suppose (by what you have printed) you must needs say *yes*. And then in the judgment of *Spanheimus*, with other persons of great name, (who are as fit to judge of *Amyralds* Doctrines, and so of *yours*, as you can be to judge of *mine*,) you deserve the name of *Arminian, Puccian, Pelagian, Semipelagian*, and not onely so, but *Socinian* also: so ease it is to give men names. You had never (I am perswaded) writ against any man as an *Arminian*, if you had not forgotten that *words have wings*. And so perhaps you will say, when you shall read my *fifth Section*.

*See your Appendix to the best of your Books, viz. *Of Justification*, p.164.

*Verba volantia, Hom.

*Sect.*4. Nor are you any whit happier in the second part of your accusation. For first, if *Grotius* and my self have

have been *imbitter'd* against the *Doctrines* of *other men*, who have made God to be the *Author* and *Fautor* of *Sin*; and have been so far *imbitter'd* as to accuse them of *blasphemy*; you will wrong your self extremely, by saying we are *too much imbitter'd*, for Doctrines *lesse impious* are called in Scripture, † *the Doctrines of Devils*. Nor have the Fathers of the Church, whether Ancient or Modern, been less imbitter'd against the *same*. (As I have plentifully * shew'd in another place.) Next I conceive that you your self have been much *more imbitter'd* upon much *less ground*. For not to speak of your *bitterness* to the most worthy *Grotius* and my unworthy self, and to the excellent *Tilenus*, it seems the men of *your way* have not escap'd you. Do not you *ask God pardon for bitter speeches* in your Treatise of *Judgment*? I am sure you *deplore* them in your † *Apology* against Mr. *Blake*, *Kendal*, *Moulin*, *Eyre*, and *Crandon*, by this good token, that you are *most bitter* to Doctor *Kendall*, whil'st you *confess* your *bitterness* to be your *crime*. Insomuch that Master *Hickman* hath shewed his *bitterness* to *me* by your example to Doctor *Kendall*. What you have said to the man who *renounc'd his Orders* and the *Lord's Prayer* I neither know nor will make a search, but I may guess there was *bitterness* by *his* to *you*. How you have used Master *Pemble* and Doctor *Twiss*, I hope I need not put you in mind. I remember your *bitterness* to such as were * *spruce in their apparel*, and *delighted in May-games*, *Morice-dances*, *Shewes*, or *Stage-Players*, whom you easily adjudge to the *pains of Hell*. I am no friend to those follies, and *thieves of time*: but had I been of your Counsel, I would have advis'd you to speak from Scripture, and to have shew'd your severity to *Rebellion* rather, or *Sacrilege*, to *Schism* and *blood-shed*, and other *fruits of the flesh*, of which a * *formal godliness* is not the *least*, and of which I shall speak as occasion serves. For many *strain* at those *Gnats*, who yet can *swallow* these *Camels*. What *bitterness* you have used to the wearing of *Surplices* and * other things which

Neither Grotius, nor any else can be too severe against blasphemy.

† 1 Tim. 4. 1.

* See Divine Purity defended, ch. 4. sect. 5, 6, 7.

† Sect. 68 p. 143, 144.

* Saints Rest, part. 3. sect. 6. p. 57.

* See 2 Tim. 3. and compare v. 2, 3, 4. with v. 5.

* Not only *Processions and Perambulations*, but *the observation of Holydays*, *repeating the Litany*, *the like formes in the Common-Prayer*, *the bowing at the name of Jesus*, *receiving the Sacrament upon the knee*, are reckoned up in the same page.

are

are *indifferent*, (considered simply in *themselves*) but made *your duties* as well as *ours*, when *commanded* by *that authority* which God hath *commanded* us to *obey*, you may see in your *Saints Rest*, *part* 3.p.91. And how severely *such bitterness* against the *Rites established in the Church* hath been censur'd by S.*Paul*, yea by God the *Holy Ghost*, you have been told by that learned and peaceable Divine Doctor *Sanderson*, in his *fifth Sermon ad Populum* p.291, 292, 293. I pray Sir bear with me, whilest I speak the words of truth and soberness: Remember what it is of which you have accused both *me* and *Grotius*. And that in order to your *amendment*, (which is an act of the greatest friendship) as well as in order to our *Defence* (which implies the *onset* to have been made from *your pen*) I have but warn'd you for the future, to † *cast the beam out of your own eye*, before you say to your brother, " *Let me pull the mote out of thine eye*.

† *Mat.*7.3.
" *ver.*4,5.

You confess [" *you are grown to a very great confidence,* " *that most of our contentions about those points are more a-* " *bout words then matter*, *Sect.*5.]

What differences are verbal, and what are real.

*Sect.*5.] So you told that *learned person* whom you describe by his *six Metaphysical Exercitations* (in your book of *Saving Faith*, p.5.) and by *his living in the publick Library at* Oxford (p.6.) that he was indeed your *assenting Adversary*, *and maintained your Assertion by a pretended Confutation*; which was strange he should do and be *learned* still. So you told *another* who writ *against you*, as *you* against *him*, that you did but *angrily agree*. (Disp.p.483.) Indeed it were happy if all the World had got that knack of *differing* into *agreement*, and of *falling out* into perfect *friendship*. What *Cicero* saith of the *Academicks* and *Peripatetticks*, that agreeing in *Things* they onely differed in *appellations*, I wish I could say of all our contentions here in *England*, in the *Points* you speak of. You have confidently *said* it, and so it lies upon *you* to make it good: 'tis not incumbent upon *me* who *never* said it. And first

Rebus congruentes Nominibus differebant. Una & consentiens duobus vocabulis Philosophiæ forma constituta est. *Cicero in Quæst.Acad.l.*1.

first of all you must shew that there are few *material* differences 'twixt *you* and *me*. To which it is consequent, that you have *embraced* the greatest part of the very opinions which I *assert* with so much *eagerness*; not that I have *receded* from my *Assertions*, for my adherence unto which you are pleased to call me an *eager man*. Again it follows from hence that there are few contentions 'twixt *me* and Mr. *Barlee*, unless it be *about words*; or that *your self* and Mr. *Barlee* are *really differing* in *opinions*. What a *fallacy* is there in your phrase, [*Our Contentions*] if you mean *your self* and *me*? for you know the *eagerness*, *interest*, and *passion*, which you make the subjects of your *rebuke* (though of no larger a size then you deal to others) were not dealt against *you*, as you dilucidly *confess* (Sect. 4.) but against some of the Consistory, from whom you *differ* in point of *Doctrine*, and with whom you *agree* in point of *Discipline*. So that the Case in effect lies clearly thus: I have written severely against some *rigid Presbyterians*, who have written against *universal Redemption*, and for God's *tempting*, *stirring up*, *exciting men to sin*; and you (a *singular Presbyterian*) are severe to these Doctrines, as well as I; but think the onely sound way whereby to answer an *Arminian*, is by asserting the Doctrine of *universal redemption*, and the natural consequences thereof, (that is) by yielding unto *me* (bearing the name of an *Arminian* from *you*, as *you* from *others*) one of the chief of my concernments. For this alone being granted, (as by *you* it is) I shall not contend for any thing else which shall not be *consequent* and *agreeable* to this one principle. Yet see and wonder at your own excess of *partiality*, which hath made you *so far* consider your *fellow-Presbyterians*, as to rebuke your *fellow-Arminians* for their *passion* and *bitterness* against those Doctrines, against which you have written with equal *keenenes*, and so contracted upon your self the odious title of *Arminian*, which yet to *you* should be the *less* odious, because *Arminius* and his *followers* were but the *better sort* of *Presbyterians*. I cannot but wish you will *declare* what you are *for*, and *stick* to what

* Eccluc. 2. 12. you shall *declare*: for he is called a * *sinner*, that *goeth two wayes* at once, ἐπαμφοτεροζῶν was the great fault of the *Gnosticks*. And ἀλλοτροσυμμαχῶν, in *Homer*, did not better fit *Mars* then it will fit any man else, who is *against* what he is *for*, as well as *for* what he is *against*.

A material difference indeed. * You say as much even of *Grotius himself*, p. 91. 92.

Sect. 6. Whereas you add so distinctly, [*That I and my Antagonist do make our selves and others believe that we differ much* * *more about them then we do*, Sect. 5.] You do not lessen but *raise* my wonder: for can there be any two points more different then those in which Mr. *Barlee* and I have differ'd? our difference stands in those things, which have set the *Calvinists* and the *Lutherans* so irreconcileably at odds. Observe the words of that holy and learned man Doctor *Jackson*, who having spoken of several sorts of *Idolaters*, (saith he) "*Besides all these, I am* "*to give you notice of some in reformed Churches who com-* "*mit the same error which they so much condemn in the* "Romanist. *The* Romanist *transforms or changes the na-* "*ture of the incorruptible God, and of Christ himself into* "*the similitude of earthly Kings and Monarchs, yet not of* "*cruel and prodigious Tyrants. But these Writers whom I* "*mean (as the* Romanists *object, and the* Lutherans *prove)* "*transform the Majesty and Glory of God into the simili-* "*tude of cruel Tyrants, yea of such base and sordid Pedants,* "*as the meanest among you would disdain should have any* "*authority over your children*; (that is) *such as delight* "*more in punishing and correcting them, then to direct or a-* "*mend them in learning or manners.*] Now if so *learned* a part of the Reformed Churches as the *Lutherans* by all must be acknowledged, have broken off all League and Amity with the *Calvinists*, even because they have conceived "*that they did not agree with them in the worship of* "*the same God, or transformed Gods nature into the simili-* "*tude of his enemy, into hatred and cruelty it self*, (as the same * Doctor hath it) sure the difference must needs be *more* then *verbal*, where one party saith (as I have done) that God's decree of Reprobation is *with respect had to sin*,

Doctor *Jackson* in his *Marthan Atha*, ch. 40. p. 3711.

* Ibid. p. 3712.

sin, which God foresaw from all eternity; and another party saith (as my Antagonists have done) that God's Decree of Reprobation is *without respect had to sin*. I need not name more Instances of the material differences which pass between us. Or if the difference were more in *words* then *matter*, then how much hath that party to answer for, by opposing my *notes* with so much *violence*?

You farther adde, (and desire *my pardon* for the addition) *That I do not well understand the true state of the Controversie, or else I would not take the breach to be wider then it is*, Sect. 5.]

Sect. 7. Who best understands it, you, or I, neither you nor I must be the *Judge*: I pray let our *Readers* enjoy that *Office*. You scrupled not to tell that learned person, whom you so far honour as to profess *you should have thought it an honour to you to have been one of his Pupills*, (of saving Faith, p. 5.) I say you scruple not to tell him, that you would have him *understand you, before he confutes you*. (p. 83.) Nor do I expect you should use me better. Nay you charge even *Grotius* with the same *mistakes* and *misunderstandings*. p. 90, 91, 92. But what *Controversie* do you mean? if that which I have managed with several persons who had opposed me, my very Opponents will say, I understood it. Nor do I think that you have *read* the whole state of the Controversie 'twixt *me* and *them*. If you speak of the Controversie 'twixt *me* and *you* in these points, you know that there *never* was any *such*. I have shew'd sometimes how you and I are at *agreement* in many points which they call *Arminian*. And you confess that most of them are but λογομαχίαι. So that if this is the thing which you call a *Controversie*, I cannot chuse but understand the *state* of it, whilest I am able to believe that your words have *truth* in them; and so by a consequence unavoidable that either you are an *Arminian*, or I am *none*. You see 'twas fitly done of you, to *ask my pardon*, and I think it as fit for me to *grant* it.

Sect. 8. One of the first heads of Controversie, about which you *suppose all quarrels will be laid aside* (Sect. 5.) is

Of heads of Controversie reconcilieable.

is no less then the whole *Supralapsarian Doctrine of Predestination & Reprobation* (and so the *Twissian* by consequence which so vehemently *condemns the Synod at* Dort) besides the Doctrine of Christ's *dying only for the elect*, together with *Physical Predetermination*, (which contains the *irresistibility of Grace*) A second is, *all matters unrevealed*. Part of the third, about *Methods* (as whether Prescience be before Decrees, &c.) All which it seems are so far yielded by *your self*, that you suppose I will consent they never be drawn into dispute, which you have not any the *least reason* to suppose, unless you readily *grant* what I *assert* in these points. For if we *differ*, how can we possibly *agree*, as to the *things* about *which* we differ? and if we *agree* in these points, let us go lovingly together against the *rigid Presbyterians* who will not partake of our agreement. Accordingly you profess (Sect. 8.) to wish no more in this Controversie, then may consist with *rational prayers, and thanksgivings for Grace*, in which you have my full grant. Nay in a very plain manner, *you grant what we call sufficient Grace, in the very sense in which we mean it, to the very worst of them that perish*, (Sect. 8.) And then (excepting your Doctrine, that whosoever is *once justified* can never *totally fall away*, which I wonder how you can retain) what difference remains 'twixt *you* and *me*? nay even *here* too you yield me one great advantage. For besides that you often seem to *waver* in your *notion* of *perseverance*, and pretend to no more then a *probability*; your Confession stands upon Record, That S. *Austin was of my mind*, and *that the Lord Primate said as much in the hearing of Master Kendall*. Nor am I out of all hope but that in tract of time you will come over to S. *Austin*, and so to *me* in this point also.

* *Account of the controv. of Persev. &c. in setting down the fourth opinion, p. 4. 5.*

Sect. 9. What you say is *not owned by the Synod of* Dort, (*Sect.* 5.) I forbear to exagitate, as well and easily I might, both because *Tilenus* is only concerned in that subject, and because I should be *glad* to find it so as *you say*, and not to dispute against *that* which I would fain have *true*.

Grotius *made not uncharitable inferences.*

true. All your Sections which next ensue, from *Sect.* 6. *to Sect.* 18. are the sole portion of *Tilenus*, whom though you call my *friend*, and seem to suspect him to be *my self*, yet you *know* you do *not know*, that he is so much as *known* to me. The *odious inferences* you charge on *Grotius*, and his *uncharitable censures* thereupon, of which you affirm him to be *too much guilty*, having been onely rais'd in *your fancy*, do onely redound to your *dishonour*. *Grotius* did not *make* loads of inferences, but *observe* and *transcribe* them from the printed writings of the *Calvinians*, by whom the inferences were *made*. And so the *want* of *charity* must lie at your door, you having *unjustly* censured *Grotius*, who with very great *justice* had censured *them*. I am exactly of your opinion *that we differ little, if at all in the point of Free-will* (Sect. 5.) For if I discern any difference, I do conceive it to be in this, that some of your expressions concerning the *freedom of the will*, have look'd more like *Pelagian* then mine have done. But of this I accuse you not, for nothing *can* be *Pelagian*, that looks but *like* it.

CHAP. III.

Sect. 1. NO sooner are you *return'd from* Tilenus *unto my self*, then you implicitly tax me of *injustice in three respects*, *Sect.* 28.]

A strange difference between the Godly, and the notoriously ungodly.

How swift you are to speak *hardly*, and to be *guilty* whilest you *reprove*, even of *that* which you *reprove*, I think I may make your self the judge, if you will but *read* when you are *cool*, what you seem to have *written*, when too much *heated*. For how could I fail in point of *justice*, *by not noting some difference between the men that are godly, and not notoriously ungodly*, when you know your own words did contain this difference, as I had faithfully and friendly set them down out of your book? since your Book lies printed, I (and thousands besides) can declare what you have written, as well as *you*, which makes me wonder

wonder (not a little) at the very *strange nature* of your *put-off*. For under the *first* of the two heads, to wit the *godly*, * you reckon up such as *have been oftentimes drunk*, such as *rashly rail*, and *lie*, *despise reproof*, and *defend their sin*, *guilty of Schism*, *and disobedience to their Guides*, and *doing much to the hurt of the Church*; yea they that commit *greater sins then these*, the *denial of Christ*, *Per-jury*, *Adultery*, *Murder*, *Incest*, *Idolatry*, as *Peter*, *Lot*, *David*, * *Solomon*, are affirm'd by you to be in the number of the *godly*. For (besides that you give them the stile of *godly* more then once) you further add, that to be *notoriously ungodly*, or *unsanctified*, (which is the second head) a man must be *worse* then all these. Do but mark your own words: "*A man must be guilty of more* "*sin then Peter was in denying and forswearing Christ that is* "*notoriously ungodly*. Observe I pray Sir, you say not [*of as much*] but, of *more* sin then *Peter* was guilty of, &c. Not onely of *as much*, but of *more sin* then *Lot*, whose sins you reckon up thus. [*He was drunk two nights together, and committed Incest twice with his own daughters, and that after the miraculous destruction of* Sodom, *of his own wife, and his own miraculous deliverance.*] Nor do you say he must be *as great*, but a *greater sinner then* Solomon *was with his seven hundred wives, and his three hundred Concubines, and gross Idolatries, when his heart was turn'd away from the Lord God of Israel, which appeared unto him twice, and commanded him not to go after other gods, but he kept not that which the Lord commanded.*] Now compare what you say of your *godly* men, with what you say of the *notoriously ungodly*, and *how wicked* you say a man must be to be *such*, not onely *as great*, but a *greater sinner* then all these, (remembring also what *filthy Uses* some men may make of *such Doctrine*) and judge what *wrong* you have done *your self*, by doing so great a wrong to *me*, who had done you *none*.

* See your words by me cited in *The Self-Revenger Exemp. ch. 4. Sect. 3. p. 115.* and compare them with your pages which there are marked.

* Remember what you call the opinion of *most of your Divines*, p. 326. and how you excuse *Solomon* for his *Idolatry*, p. 327. in contradiction to the Text, and to your self, p. 328.

The excessive danger of making the greatest sinners to dream themselves into a Saintship.

Sect. 2. I must expostulate again about your *second* Accusation of my injustice (*Sect.* 18.) for first did you not say, (in the place by me cited) that a *man who is notoriously ungodly*, i.e. *unsanctified, must be a greater sinner then* Solomon *was? &c.* Secondly, *Where* did you adde, *that 'tis the common opinion*, as that doth signifie *not your own?* you are not *singular* in *all* you think, the opinion may be *common* and the more likely to be *yours*, not do I *doubt* but that it *is*: if I thought it were *not*, you should hear *more* from me then now you shall. Thirdly, What if you *desired all men to take heed? &c.* that is no more then to *dig a pit* and then to bid men *beware* that they fall not *in*. But how can you or I be sure that they who believe what you have taught (to wit, that *such sins* cannot *unsanctifie*, or put them into a *state of damnation*, or make them cease to be *Godly*,) will *abstain* from such sins when strongly *tempted?* O Sir, take heed that you *scandalize* not your *weak*, or your *wilful* brethren: that you *strengthen not the hands of evil-doers*: rather then so, *it were better that you were cast into the Sea.* (*Mat.* 18.6.) Fourthly, This Caution was peculiar to *Solomon*, not to *any* of those sinners you nam'd *besides*. Fifthly, Your *supposing the sin of* David with an *Et cætera*, (which must regularly include the sins of *Lot* and *Solomon*, *the Railing Professor*, *the Rebel*, and the *Schismatick*, and all the rest which you reckon up in your ample Catalogue) to have been extremely *different from the like in a graceless man*, will prove a sad principle of all *security in sinning* to one who doubts not but that *himself is a gracious man*. For he (poor wretch) will be sure to hope that his *Drunkenness* is like *Noah's*, his *Incest* like *Lot's*, his *Adultery* and his *Murder*, of all the world, like *David's*, and not at all like the *sins of the graceless man*. Suppose a man shall be *convinced* of having been many times *drunk*, besides a *Railer*, a *Liar*, a *Rebel*, and a *Schismatick*, may he not plead for all that, he is a *sanctified man*, and in the number of the *godly*, and cannot possibly miscarry when once he hath been *sanctified*, as he takes it for *granted* that he hath *been*? Nay

may

may he not fiercely *stand* to it, and cite the words of Mr. *Baxter* in his *justification*; and what are the words of Mr. *Baxter* but these that follow? [* "*He that hath oftentimes been drunk may yet have true Grace, and be in the number of the godly. How many Professors will rail and lie in their passion? how few will take well a reproof, but rather defend their sin? How many in* THESE TIMES *that we doubt not to be Godly, have been guilty of disobedience to their Guides, and of Schism, and doing much to the hurt of the Church?*] If the *horrid nature* of these sins be pressed *home* to such a Wretch, he may presently flie out into a greater indignation, and urge (in the words of Mr. *Baxter* again) * That *his Drunkenness, Perjury, Railing, Lying, Rebellion, Schism, and persecution of the Church, are exceedingly different from the like faults in a graceless man, in regard of manner, ends, concomitants, &c.*

* Disput. 3. p. 319. &c.

* Grotian Relig. Præf. Sect. 18. towards the end.

The danger exemplified in a Presbyterian woman.

Sir, I cannot but tell you on this occasion, that I have laboured for *four* (if not *five*) *howers* together, (and there is witnesse of what I say) to make a *woman* in *this County* (not many miles from this place) *asham'd* and *sorry* for her *adultery*, which she took an occasion to *profess* unto me she had *committed*, (naming the *person* with whom, and *many circumstances* with which) and that in the presence of *others* also, who together with my self were much amaz'd at her confidence, we having never seen her face before. She did not believe that the sin had done her any hurt, or any whit lessen'd her in the favour of God. She acknowledged that *Adultery* was a *damnable sin* in the *Graceless*, but not in her who had *Grace*. And (as she was indeed the most fluent Disputant from *Scripture* that I have ever met with of *either sex*, she seeming to have had the *whole Bible* in her memory, so many chapters and verses came so readily into her mouth,) She urged *David* and *Solomon*, (as you have done) with as many more as would make you wonder, in *her excuse*. She told me how she had been grounded in the opinion she was of by the *Ministers* of the *Lecture* which she frequented;

naming

naming *one* in particular of great authority and eminence in that side of the County (whom I shall not name, unless need require, as being more cateful of his credit, then his followers have been;) She alledged the great difference between the sins of the *regenerate* and *unregenerate*. She said she had learn'd from the Pulpit (of that noted man before hinted) that the *sins of the regenerate were ever committed with a reluctancy, and trouble of mind; which reluctancy she had in her commission of adultery*; upon which she concluded 'twas but an *infirmity of the flesh*, not an *obliquity* of her *will*, that her temptations were *unresistible*; and the *spirit* was *willing* to be obedient, though the *flesh* was *weak*. She made the same perverse use of the *seventh chapter to the Romanes*, by † *wresting* it just to serve her turn, as the Preachers whom she admired were wont to do. But (by the blessing of God on my endeavours) I convinced her of the *danger* as well as *madness* of her *opinions*, and of the deadly influence they had had upon her *practice*, and how the Scripture was *grossely wrested* from its *true intent* and *importance* to serve for such *vile offices* of which she had had some *sad experience*. I made it manifest that she had sin'd *against conscience*, and that her sin was * *aggravated* by *that*, which she had alledged as an *excuse* and a *lessening* of it, to wit, the *reluctancy of her mind*, which shew'd her sin to have been *wilful*. Now whether this *Presbyterian woman* (for such she was in all points when first she came *into my house*) were *sent* on purpose to baffle me with her *command of words*, and prodigious *memory of the Scriptures*, or whether she came of her *own accord* to hear what I could say in opposition to her Teachers, I cannot tell. But I have witness of her *conviction* before she went out of my *doors* (which was about four or five hours from after the time when she came in) and since that time I never saw her but *once*, when meeting me and another walking togeher in my Churchyard (about four or five miles from her own abode) *she heartily*

† 2 Pet. 3. 16.

* Est actuale mortale, in labente post reconciliationem, actio interior, vel exterior, pugnans cum lege Dei, facta contra conscientiam. *Milanchth. de Peccat. Actual.* p. 83.

heartily thanks me for my instructions. Sir, I have told you this great truth with a most *charitable intention* to you, and others, upon a most pregnant occasion which you have offerd me from the Press: and had it not been for this occasion, this Narrative might have died in perfect *silence.* Had I not known that there were *Gnosticks* in the Apostles times, and what the *Ranters* in these times are wont to *hold*, and upon *what Principles* they ground their Doctrines, and how avowedly they have *practised* according to what they have *believed*; nay had I not read *some books* which I shall cite in due place, and compared my *other* readings with what I have read out of *your own*; I should hardly have had the courage to tell a story so *strange* as might seem to some people to be hardly *true.* But besides that I have witnesses from *within*, and *without* me, I have a witness *above* me too, for "*The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.* I will shut up this *Section* (but not this *subject*) with an useful passage out of *Grotius* in his *Animadversions* upon *Rivet. I wonder* (saith he) *that they should vex the consciences of others, who do enervate by their opinion all force of conscience, when they teach that Murders and Adulteries are not imputed to the justified, or to them whom they call Elect, nor take away from them the state of Grace, and that for this reason, because they do such villanies with a reluctant mind, that is to say, against their conscience.*

" 2 Cor. 11. 31.

Hugon. Grot. Anim. in Animadv. Andr. Riveti, p. 80, 81. Miror vero conscientiam aliorum lacessere eos qui omnem vim conscientiæ adimunt suo dogmate, cum doceant justificatis sive electis *suis* non imputari, non auferre statum Gratiæ, Adulteria & Homicidia, ideo quod ea faciant animo reluctante, id est, contra conscientiam.

The sins of David with their circumstances.

Sect. 3. But let us consider the *sins* of *David in regard of manner, ends, and concomitants, and see how they difference his sins from the like in a graceless man*, as you affirm Sect. 18.] First *David deliberately* defiled *Bathsheba*, 2 *Sam.* 11. 2, 3, 4. Next, to *palliate* his adultery, he *cogg'd* with her husband. (v. 8.) Thirdly, finding that would not take, he dissembled with him yet farther, and *made him drunk*, (v. 13.) Fourthly, Seeing that that plot had failed,

ed, he contrived the *murder* of the Husband, that so he might carry away the wife (v.15.) Fifthly, when *Uriah's death* was certified to *David*, he plaid the *hypocrite* with the *Messenger*, and bid him tell *Joab*, *That the sword devoureth one as well as another*, (v.25.) Sixthly, *Uriah* being thus basely murdered, *David married* his *Widow*, which was to kill him over and over, even after he was dead, (v.27.) Seventhly, his *murder* was the more *horrible*, because he gratified the *Ammonites*, and caused the murder of a great *multitude* of his *loyal subjects*, meerly that *Uriah* might be murder'd with them, (v.15,16,17.) Eighthly, All this while he plaid the *Hypocrite* with God, both in his publick and private acts of Religion, lifting up *unclean hands*, and *impure eyes*, *unhallowed lipps*, and a *stony heart*, by which, how his sacrifice was polluted, I pray (Sir) see, and consider in the *first Chapter of Isaiah*, v.11,12,13,14,15. Add to all this, that *David* was [1] a *King*, and should have given a better example; [2] a *Prophet*, who should have *taught* whom he *perverted*; [3] a person of high endowments of Grace and Nature, the abuse of which was the greater sin; [4] One who had women enough at *home*, both *Wives* and *Concubines*, which made his seeking *abroad* the more unexcusable; [5] One to whom *Uriah* was an * affectionate friend, as well as a faithful and valiant subject; fighting against the Kings *enemies*, whilest the King was acting *enmity* to *him* and *his*. Besides so many distinct *sins*, and so many *aggravations*; which could not but make them † *exceeding sinful*: he lived *indulgently* in them from month to month; was *lull'd* in *carnal security*; and as if his *conscience* had been * *seared as it were with a hot iron*, he never so much as said, † *what have I done?* he was not startled with *Nathans Apologue*, (2 Sam.12.1,2,3,4,5,6.) untill he was fain to *indigitate* the *moral* of it, applying it *home* unto himself, with a *Tu es homo*, *Thou art the man*. (v.7.) Now if with all that I have spoken of *David's guilt*, you will compare the *whole speech* which God sent *Nathan* to rouze him with, and consider the greatnesse

* 2 Sam.11.11.

† Rom.7.13.

* 1 Tim.4.2.

† Jerem.8.6.

nesse of his *ingratitude* (from ver. 7. to v. 10.) which is the * greatest aggravation that sins are capable of; and how *great an occasion he had given to the enemies of the Lord to blasphemie*, (v. 14.) whereby he became a very *scandalous* and *hurtful sinner*. I doubt it will set you very hard, to shew me the *difference* (of which you speak) between *this*, and the *sin* of a *graceless man*, in regard of the *manner*, *ends*, *concomitants*, or what other circumstances soever, the *complication* of impieties was *cloathed* with.

* Homicidæ, Tyranni, Fures, Adulteri, Raptores, Sacrilegi, Prodictores erunt. Sed infra ista omnia ingratus est. *Senec. l. 1. de Beneficiis cap. 10. mihi p. 386.*

Peter's sins very different from those of David.

Sect. 4. The sin of *Peter* I shall not prosecute, as having been (in all points) extremely *different* from that of *David*, and much more capable of excuse. For 'twas by sudden *surreption* that *Peter* sin'd; his temptation was not onely *great*, but came upon him by a *surprisal*: And sudden *fear*, more then any thing * *betrayeth the succours which reason offereth*. Besides, he *speedily* repented with † *bitter tears*, and brought forth such *early* (that I may not onely say, such *ample*) *fruits* as were indeed most * *worthy of repentance*. Yet I pray Sir, reflect on your own acknowledgment, you say that *Peter* as well as *David was put by his sin into a present incapacity for heaven* (Sect. 18.) which what is it but to say, *he was in a state of damnation*? for being *incapable of heaven*, he must needs (at that time) have been *capable of hell*; unless you will feign him in good *earnest*, (as the *Papists* in *jest* have drawn the *picture* of *Erasmus*) to have been in a capacity neither for *heaven* nor for *hell*, which being not to be imagin'd, you have *granted* the thing that I contend for, and *blown* to the ground with *one breath*, what you bestowed so much *cost* and *care* in *building*. And why do you adde, [*that repentance actual, deep and serious too, was necessary to the recovery & forgiveness of Peter and David*] but because you inwardly confessed that *without their repentance* they had been *damned*, and that *before* they repented they were in a *state of damnation*; for if they were not, in what respect was it *needful* they should *repent*? If they could have been *saved*

* *Wisd. 17. 12.*

† *Mat. 26. 75.*

* *Luke 3. 8.*

ved without being *forgiven*, then their *forgiveness* was not *necessary* to their *salvation*. Or if they could have been *forgiven* without having *repented*, then their *repentance* was not necessary to their *forgiveness*: but if *both* were necessary to *both*, (as you evidently acknowledge) then whilest they were *destitute* of *both*, they were in a *state* of *damnation*. And thus you see every way you *establish* my Doctrine, whilest you *resist* it. Yet after all I must tell you, that your acknowledging the *necessity* of *repentance* to the recovery of the *regenerate* after their *degeneration*, will make a very poor amends for the *Pit* I spake of (in my *second section*) whilest *Perseverance* is so * taught, as you have taught it.

* See the sixteenth Sect. of your Preface.

*Sect.*5. Having done with your eighteenth, I now proceed to your nineteenth Section: where, of *Solomon's case* you profess you are *uncertain*, though you know where you said, that a man must be a *greater sinner* then *Solomon*, to be notoriously ungodly: but now it seems you are *doubtful* whether he repented before his death; or if you think that he did, and that he was one of the *elect*, then it seems you are *doubtful* whether *some*, even of *them*, may not become so *unsanctified*, as to be in a *state* of *damnation*, till they *repent*: which uncertainty you mean, I am not certain, and so I pass him over, as you have done. *David* and *Peter* are again ill coupled, the one sinning by surreption, and straight recovering; the other *deliberately sinning*, contriving mischief to *Uriah*, and *plotting* how to get *Bathsheba*, and *continuing* in his wickedness no little time, and therefore he is most fit for our consideration. For since you affirmed even of *Peter* that his sin had put him at that present into an *incapacity for heaven*, how much rather must you acknowledge the same of *David*? To your particulars of *him*, I shall speak in order.

Of Solomon's *state and its uncertainty.*

*Sect.*6. To your Preparatory præfixed before your Reasons in the entrance of your *Sect.* 19. I briefly say (in preparation to my answers) that 'tis not said on either side, that *David* was *utterly graceless*; nor *need* it be said by either side; it being frequently your Doctrine, [That even the

The Reprobates are granted by Mr. Baxter *to have Grace sufficient.*

Look back on the eighth Section of your Preface.

the *Reprobates* have *grace* and *grace sufficient*, and that *this* is given to the *worst that perish, and that in the motion of the Jesuists; and that this is granted by the Dominicans and the Synod of* Dort.] Nor do I say, that he needed any *other new birth* then *Repentance* is. Repentance was *necessary*, which was truly equivalent to new birth. (and so much you confessed Sect. 18.) It was in order to his *repentance* that *Nathan* was sent; and *before* he had *not* that *special grace*; in which respect (if you please] he was *unsanctified* and *graceless*. But Grace he might have, as that signifies no more then the *gift of God*, by which he was *sufficiently enabled to repent*: such Grace he *had*, and made *use* of it when *Nathan* came, nor do I doubt of his *having* it *long before*, whilest yet (we know) he made *no use* of it at all. Again I will prove from your own Concessions, that he might have some degree of other *virtues*, and those the effects of the *Grace* I spake of, and yet be *fallen* from a *regenerate state*: my reason is, because *this* requires an *universality of obedience*, and is not reconcileable with living in any such *mortal* or *deadly* sin, as *Adultery* and *Murder* are known to be. Sir, I heartily wish, that whil'st you are writing *new* books, you will carefully *remember* what you have written in *your* old ones. Before I go any farther, I will premise a few things which you have taught in your Treatise of *Saving Faith*, which you pronounce to be *specifically*, not onely *gradually different from all common Faith*, and this in the *Title-page* of your book.

Mr. Baxter's Description of Common Grace and its effects.

Now you say (p. 43. of that Tract) *That* men are sometimes enabled by *common Grace to be abased in the feeling of their sin and misery, to be humbled by attrition, to cry out of their sin and folly, and day and night to beg for Grace and Mercy; they like the word and wayes of God, think his servants the best and happiest men, wish that they were such themselves, avoid as much of gross and wilful sinning, and continue as much in hearing, reading the word, enquiring, consideration, as common Grace may bring them to do. They have as much belief of the Gospel, as much desire after Christ, and holiness, and heaven, and as much to God, and the*

the Redeemer, and the Saints, as common Grace can lead them to. They have either a knowledge of their being yet short of true Christianity, or at least are much afraid of it, (which no doubt but common Grace may bring them to) * *and therefore are under a prudent impatiency till saving Grace come in, and the Spirit have sealed them up to the day of Redemption, and are crying out, what shall we do to be saved?]* In a word it seems you take *common* and *special Grace* to be so like unto each other, that you profess † *to fear very much, lest many learned, civil, orthodox men do take common Grace to be special, and so delude their own soules in the trial of themselves.* You farther adde, * *That there are many common gifts in man which are no more loseable then saving Grace.* You adde in the same Treatise (by way of Postscript to the Reader,) † *That an unsanctified man may love the true God, and believe in Jesus Christ the Redeemer.* And again, * *that by common Grace men may have true Faith and Love.* And again, * *That we know not in our change just when common Grace left, and special grace began.* (where I am glad to find you *condemning* the *practice* of the *triers.*) Again you lay down this Proposition, * [*That one and the same man may have two contrary ultimate ends of his particular actions, even the pleasing of God, and the pleasing of his flesh.*] In your first reason you say, [*That the very same heart may be partly sanctified, and partly unsanctified.*] You say in your second, [*That a godly man when he is drawn to eat or drink too much, doth it not onely as a mistaken means to Gods glory, but ultimately to please his flesh.*] *Peter* and *David* are your examples, and of them you thus speak. [Peter *did not only mischoose a means to Gods glory when he denied his Master. Either* David *in adultery did desire flesh pleasing for it self, or for some other end; if for it self, then it was his ultimate end in that Act: if for somewhat else as his end, for what? no one will say his end was Gods glory. And there is nothing else to be it.*] Having premised these things for several uses which I foresee, I now return to the particulars of your *nineteenth Section* which lies before me.

* Ibid p.44.

† Ibid. p.49.

* Ibid p.49.

† Ibid p.91.

* Ibid. p. 94.

† Ibid. p.96.

* Ibid. p.92.

Look forwards on the twelfth Section of this Chapt.

Sect. 7.

Of men twice sanctified.

Sect.7. [*You do not find in Scripture, that they or any others were twice regenerate or sanctified*, Sect.19.] But taking *Repentance* for a Regeneration, you find in Scripture what you say you find not; to wit, that some have *twice repented*, that is, they have risen by Gods grace to undertake his service, and have *fallen* after that, and by the Grace of God they have *risen* again, so saith the Article of our Church. [*After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from Grace given, and fall into sin, and by the Grace of God we may rise again and amend our lives.*] Nor will any deny this, except the *Montanists* and the *Novatians*, and the *Family of Love*, the *Catharists*, and the *Jauinians*, and such as are of their kindred. (I wish that no such *heresie* were still alive.) But I think I may say of the *Novatians*, that though they would not yield place of *absolution* in the *Church*, for such as had fallen, after Baptism, into any *deadly* or *wilful sin*; yet for *Repentance with God*, they willingly yielded them a place. And I am sure the *Church Catholick* hath alwayes held *both*.

Artic.16.

Concerning the importance of Heb 6. & 10.

Sect.8. You tell me what *two passages* (*Heb. 6. & 10.*) *do seem to import*, Sect. 19.] Wherein you did well to say they *seem'd* so, for you do *more* then *seem* not at all to understand those famous passages of Scripture. It is not absolute *impossibility*, but an extreme great *difficulty*, which there is meant: nor is it any lesse fall, then into wilful *Apostacy* from the *profession* of *Christianity*, which is there spoken of. To shew you the greatness of your mistake, I cannot take a more short, or effectual course, then by referring you to the *Notes* of the learned and Reverend Doctor *Hammond* on either place, more particularly, on *Heb.6.4. & Heb.10.26.* And since those places do not serve for your turn, you need not be told how exceedingly much they make *against* it.

You say that *David by Gods own Testimony was one of those hearers* (in our Saviours parable) *who like the good ground that gives deep rooting to the seed, do not fall away in trial*, Sect.19.]

Sect. 9. Whatever *David* was *before* his Adultery and his Murder, or whatever he was from *after* the time of his *repentance*, he was not good by God's testimony, in the *whole matter of* Uriah, or in any *part* of it. For *that* is * *excepted* by God in Scripture, and you cannot but know that this is the *David* of whom we speak; so that before you were aware (if not on purpose) you have made a *Transition* ab *Hypothesi*, ad *Thesin*. It is true that God hath given a good testimony of *David* in the place I cited, and with the *exception* of which I spake. But *this* was also *God's testimony* concerning *David*, [† *That he had despised the commandement of the Lord, to do evil in his sight. That he had killed* Uriah *the Hittite with the sword*; (and not onely so, but) *that he had killed him also with the sword of the* (prophane) *children of* Ammon; (not onely so, but) *that he had taken his wife from him to be his own wife.*] With this particular testimony you may do well to compare God's general rule. * *That when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, — all his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned.* In so much, that *David* must be confessed, notwithstanding the Parable of the good ground, to have fallen away in time of triall. My way of arguing is, *ab actu ad potentiam*, which you know is uncontroulable. David *fell*, therefore he *might fall*. And against matter of *Fact*, your way of disputing is most unhappy.

Gods testimony of David *twofold, each to be compared with the Rule,* Ezek. 18.24, *&c.* a * 1 King. 15.5.

† 2 Sam. 12.9.

* Ezek. 18. 24. & 26.

But no Scripture tells us (say you) *that* David *was void of charity, though as to the degree, and act, and sense, it was decayed, and so far* David *beggs for a recovery.* Sect. 19.]

Sect. 10. If *no Scripture* had so told us, your *negative Argument* would be of no force. But Scripture tells *enough*, as I lately shew'd you, when God *excepted* his dealings with *Uriah*, that *exception* was as much *Scripture*, as any other passage which you can name. The Scripture tells how he *continued* in his wickedness *without repentance*, untill the message of *Nathan*, which was *neer* a whole year, if not a great deal *beyond* it, for his child by *Bathsheba* was * *born* I know not *how long* before he repented of his *unclean-*

How far charity was decayed in David; *and how hard it is to murder wilfully in love.*

* See 2 Sam. 12.14, 15.

uncleanness, which shews a greater decay, then you acknowledge. And accordingly he prayed, *Create in me a clean heart, O God, renew a right spirit within me.* I pray Sir mark it, the clean heart was now to be *created*, and the right spirit to be *renewed*; which had certainly been *needless*, had its *cleanness* and *rectitude continued* to him. Besides, † you tell us of *David*, That *he desired flesh pleasing for it self, and not at all for Gods glory*, nor is it imaginable he should commit Adultery to *please God*: and so out of your mouth I do infer his having been *unsanctified*, because you say that the same man, by designing to *please God*, and *to please his flesh too*, as two *ultimate ends* of his particular actions, may be partly *unsanctified*, as well as partly *sanctified*. Then is not he *wholly unsanctified*, who intends *not the pleasing* of *God* at all? or is he not *wholly unsanctified* who designes to *please God* by heaping *Murder* upon *Adultery*, and adding *Drunkenness* to *Thirst*? The murderous Jews were not, sure, the *less unsanctified* for *killing the Apostles to do* * *God service*; nor was *Saul* the less *unsanctified* before the time of his conversion, for that he *thought it his* † *duty to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus.* Whatever *David's ends* were, his *sins* were such (by your confession) as did put him into no less then an *incapacity for heaven.* But where was his *charity* you speak of, when he *contrived* and *effected Uriah's* death? To say he *murdered a man in love* will be of very ill consequence: and *he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?* even Injustice and Charity do seem to me irreconcileable. And though there are who have pretended to hate and persecute their neighbours in the fear of God, yet am I assured by an Apostle, *That whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point*, (that great point especially of doing his duty towards his neighbour) *he is guilty of all.* And whereas you said at the beginning of your Section, *you believe not that* David *had wholly excussed the spirit of God*: I oppose the *belief* of the great *Melanchthon*; *Excussit* David *fidem & Spiritum Sanctum, cum raperet alterum conjugem, & quidem multipliciter*

Psal. 51. 10.

† Of saving Faith, p. 92.

* John 16. 2.

† Ἐξέα ἰμαυτῷ δοῦν.

1 Joh. 4. 20.

Jam. 2. 10.

Melanchth. de bonis operibus. p. 179. 180.

pliciter Spiritum Sanctum perturbavit. Primum in corde *suo, unde pulsus est in Adulterio; deinde in multis sanctis, quorum aliis scandalum attulit dolorem, aliis fuit occasio exitii, &c.* I need not use this Authority, (having abundantly done my work without it) but think it more then sufficient thus to counterpoise *your own.*

You urge yet farther [David *prayes Psal.*50. *That God would not for that sin take his Holy Spirit from him, which implies yet that he had it.* Sect.19.]

*Sect.*11. But (1.) he made that Prayer after the time of his *repentance*, whereas the *exeussion* of God's *Spirit* was in the commission of his *sins.* (2.) Not doth it signifie any more, then that God had been *highly provoked* by him so to do. And (3.) if God had not utterly withdrawn his grace, but left him what was *sufficient* to *enable* him to *repent* a great deal *sooner* then he had done, that was the *height* of God's *goodness* which infers the * *heightning* of his *sins*, in that he had so long *abus'd* it. For I must put you in remembrance, that it is not meerly the *having of Grace*, (to-wit, the *habit*) without the *actual* imployment of it, that will ever stand us in any stead; but on the contrary, † a Talent wrapt in a Napkin will evince us to be *sloathful* and *unprofitable servants*, whom our Judge will *cast into outer darkness.*

Of David's *Prayer* Psal.51.

* Rom.2.4,5.

† Mat.25.25, 26,30.

But say you, [*The thing in it self seems utterly improbable, that* David *and* Peter *should have no love to God, after those particular sins*, Sect.19.]

*Sect.*12. What can be your meaning of [*no love to God*,] when you * confess that the *unsanctified* have *some* love to him? Will you prove a man Regenerate in the complication of his impieties, by having *thus* left in him more then *which* you do allow to the *unregenerate?* you know what I told you out of your self in the sixth Section of this Chapter. 2. What do you mean by your other phrase, [*after those particular sins?*] a great while *after*, he *repented*, and was no longer that *impenitent* of whom we both speak. If your meaning is, that *immediately* after his sins committed, he had *some love* to God, but *in the acts of* com-

His being clearly unsanctified by his accumulated sins.

* See *of saving Faith* p.47, *&c.* p.49. 91. 94.96.

commission had *none* at all; you confess there was a time, when he was *wholly unsanctified*, and had *less* Grace then many, who yet haue not *saving*, but *common* Grace. 3. When you adde *that his sins were odious, and deserved an utter desertion of God* (Sect. 19.) Do you speak after the Tenor of the *Second Covenant*, and as God hath threatned every man to reward him * *according to his works*? Then 'tis true (what you say) that the *sins unrepented of* deserved *utter desertion*, and so *damnation*; which is the granting of all that I contend for. But if you mean by *utter desertion*, God's withdrawing that Grace which was *absolutely necessary* to his *Repentance*, then you grant *more* then I should ever have demanded; not knowing that God in the Gospel hath threatned *such* sins with *such* desertion, 'till *death* hath seized upon the sinner, or the sinner *hardened his heart* to such a desperate degree as *Pharaoh* did, *Exod.*9.14,16,27,34. However it be, God's *not inflicting* so sore a punishment is no argument at all, that the sinner was not fallen *from Grace*, by abusing that Grace which God had given him, and that *abuse* of *Grace given*, is the thing which God *punishes* because he *hates*; not the *negation* or *want* of Grace, which by being *not given*, cannot be said to be *abused*.

* Rom.2.6.

You say, *This sudden prevalency of sensuality did not so far change the judgment of* David, that hereupon he *habitually esteemed the creature above God, and valued the pleasures of sin, before the pleasing, and the favour of God*, Sect.19.]

A signal quick-sand to be avoided by all that are ensnared with the novel notion of perseverance.

*Sect.*13. Here you speak of a *sudden prevalency*, whereas you cannot but know (what I largely shew'd out of the Text) that *David* was a *contriving* and *deliberate sinner*. And I pray Sir tell me, Did not *David habitually*, (to wit) *at least for a year*, value the *pleasures* of sin before the *favour* of God? Here is a very great *Quick-sand* which must be carefully avoided, or else a sinner may *go-on*, in *Adultery*, *Murder*, and other *villanies*, contenting himself with this *Cordial*, (but I beseech you give no more such) that *he doth not habitually esteem the creature above God.*

God. Sir, Your soul is very pretious and dear unto me, and by the interest which I have in the *perfect happiness* of my Brethren, I shall conjure you to consider, whether such Doctrine hath not been hurtful, as well to *your self*, as to weaker men. If actually in the time of sinning, sensuality prevailed against the act of charity, then the sin of *David* being *deliberate*, (as in *Peter* 'twas *not*,) and very long *continued in*, (as again in *Peter* it was *not*,) how can it modestly be denied, but that for so long a time as *David lived* in his impieties, and as to those *species* of impieties in which he lived, it *habitually prevailed* in him? which should you possibly deny, you know what follows. Your pleading that the *judgment* of *David* was not *changed*, would do you no service, if I should grant it: for there is hardly any sinner, who doth judge of the *creature* as more *valuable* then *God*, when asked which he doth value most; nor is a man the *less* but the *greater* sinner for deliberately acting *against his judgment*. And again remember how much you gave to the *unsanctified man*.

Yet again you say, *That* David's *Faith was not habitually extirpated, nor was he turned unbeliever*. Sect.19.]

Of Faith as a practical adherence unto God.

Sect. 14. But neither are *they unbelievers*, whom you allow to have *Faith*, and yet deny to have *saving Grace*, as I shew'd you from your writings in my Sect.6. But as *Faith* is a *Practical adherence* unto *God*, and implies an uniform *obedience* to his *commands*, you know that *David* wanted *Faith*; *he obeyed not God*, by which *believing* is expressed in holy * Scripture. It was not *that Faith* which *worketh by love*, which is the *fulfilling of the Law*, which consisted with so much injury, as the robbing *Uriah* both of his *honour* and of his *life*. To be brief, If Faith be truly inseparable from charity, and *David* can no more love *God and* Bathsheba (*another man's wife*) then † *God*, and *Mammon*; then must *David* needs have wanted both *Faith & Charity*. When you say (*of saving Faith p.92.*) that *one and the same man may have two contrary ultimate ends of his particular actions, even the pleasing of God*, and *the pleasing of his flesh*, (giving your instance even in *David*,) you seem

* They have not all *obeyed* the Gospel. For *Esay* saith *who hath* believed *our report?* Rom.10.16.

† *Luk.16.13.*

seem to imply a contradiction to the words of our Lord, who saith, * *no man can serve two Masters. Dagon* and the *Ark* cannot dwell under a roof, but that the *one* will subvert the *other*. And even *he* is † *against* Christ, who is not *for* him. Indeed there are in the world who make a *mixture* of *Religions*, like the * people of *Sepharvaim*, *Cuth*, and *Hamath*, *fearing the Lord and serving their own gods*. But the former was in *Hypocrisie*, for it is said in the following verse, † *they feared not the Lord*, which *trasloparin*, or literal *form* of contradiction, doth evince the truth of our Saviours words, that *no one servant* can *really* and *truly* serve *God* and *Mammon*, for *either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other*. But what kind of *Principles* those are, which lead the people to such *mixtures*, and of how dangerous importance such mixtures are, I leave to the guess of the considering Reader.

* Ibid.

† Mat. 12. 30.

* 2 Kings 17. 32, 33.

† ver. 34.

David was soberly put to it.

Sect. 15. What *you think that* David *would not have done had he been put to it upon sober deliberation* (Sect. 19.) is as little to the purpose as all the rest, and onely needs to be referred to my former answers, or to what I collected Sect. 6. yet here I can adde, that *David* was *soberly put to it*, (as having acted *deliberately*, with a great deal of *project* and *contrivance*) yet did he not choose the love of God before the pleasure of sin (as *Moses* did, *Heb.* 11. 25, 26.) which indeed was *contrary* to the *love of God*.

You say, *It is not likely that this one act should turn his heart into as graceless a frame, as the ungodly themselves that never were sanctified*, Sect. 19.]

The fallacious use of the word Graceless.

Sect. 16. As it is not *likely*, so it need not be *said*. For if *graceless* here signifies or supposeth such a sinner, as from whom God's grace is so far withdrawn, that he hath not left what is *sufficient* for his *return*; all *unsanctified* men are not *such* sinners as *these*. You affirm that *grace sufficient is given to the worst of them that perish*, (Sect. 8.) and therefore you cannot prove that *David* was *sanctified*

Recessurum non deserit antequam deserat. Et facit plerumque ne deserat; aut etiamsi recesserit, ut redeat, *Prosper. Respon. ad object. Vincent.* 14.

tified, (whilest impenitently *guilty* both of *Adultery* and *Murder*) for having just as much grace as you allow to *Reprobates*, whom you will not allow to have been *sanctified*. Whereas you speak of *one Act as unlikely to turn the heart of* David, you know that *David* committed *many*, and with a *manifold aggravation*. Nor do I doubt but he had power to have repented *sooner* then he did, if he had not been wanting to himself. Yet the Scripture having pronounced that the estate of those men who have fallen from grace is much more hardly to be recovered, and *worse* (by consequence then *theirs*, who *never knew the way of righteousnesse*; certainly *more* Grace was necessary for the reducing of *David* (*as he was*) then if he had *never* been a *sanctified man*. Now seeing that *David* was effectually *reduced*, and that by *Grace*, I am obliged to avow, that either *more* grace was *left*, or *more* was *given*. And for this last, you have my reason. But however it be, it cannot but be to my advantage, it being no extenuation, but an *aggravation* of his crimes, throughout the time of his *impenitence*.

* 2 Pet. 2.10, 21.

You say, *you think it was the habit of Grace, which the words of* Nathan *to* David *excited, and did bring again to act*, Sect.19.]

Sect. 17. But sure your *thinking* is no *proof* of the point. I may rather conclude it was *not* the habit of Grace excited, if you your self do *but think so*, for whose interest it is to have it *so without question*. And if it *were* as you *think*, by so much the *greater* was *David's guilt*; that having so great a gift of God as that *habit of Grace*, he acted *contrarily* to it, in so hainous a manner, and degree. To *have* an habit of Grace, and *not to use* it, yea to *abuse* it by *grosse impieties*, will no more excuse a man's wickednesse, then the bare *haveing* of a *Talent*, and * thrusting it into a *sink*. What you adde of S. *Peter* is not *home* to the purpose, and that for those reasons, which I have given * already once for all.

Some are thinkers to their own prejudice.

* *Mat.*25.25.

* *Look back on Sect.*4. *of this Chapter.*

*Sect.*18.

It is another quick-sand to be avoided, which leads men to think they are the better for their hypocrisie.

Sect. 18. Your *verily thinking that* David *after his sin went on in his ordinary course of Religion, and obedience in all things else*, (Sect. 19.) will not stand you in any stead, (besides that again you do *but think* it,) unless it be to make proof, that many *goers to Church*, and *doers* of some things in the *service of God*, may yet *deliberately sin* in a hideous manner, and so become *liable* to *condemnation*. Many desperate sinners are the more punctual in their outward acts of Religion, and strive to grow *eminent* for some good deeds, to the end that they may sin with the more *security* and *success*, but they are not the *better* for being *Hypocrites*, and therefore not the more *excusable*; this I take to be another great *quick-sand*, in which because *many* are *swallowed up* in these times, I was not at ease with my self till I had *publickly* given some *warning* of it in the *first chapter* of the *second part* of my *Sinner impleaded*. And which I do *more* wish *read*, then all the things that I have written. I pray Sir, consider on this occasion, *Isa.* 1.11,12,13,14,15,16,17. As for David's *daily going unto God, in publick and in private*, all the space of his continuance in sin without repentance, it was not joyned with *that love of God* which doth exclude the *love of Mammon*; it having been *joyned* with *the love of unlawful pleasures*, and by consequence unavailable in the sight of God. You adde that *these things are to you improbable*: still implying a confession that you are not *certain*, or *assured* of what you so zealously *contend for*. The truth being proved, and demonstrated to lie on S. *Austin's and Prosper's side*, (both which Fathers, and those others that went before them, you have publickly confessed to be against you) it matters not what may seem *improbable*, much lesse improbable to *you*.

You say that *David had built upon a rock, and that they who build on the rock, persevere in trial*, Mat. 7.25. concluding herewith your *nineteenth Section*.

What it is, and is not to build upon a rock.

Sect. 19. But his *lying with Bathsheba* was not *building on a rock*, much less his *murdering of good Uriah*; and that he really did *both*, the Scripture tells us. That phrase of

of *building upon a rock* doth not signifie (in general) whatsoever building upon God. (for some build *so*, and yet but *slightly*.) But it peculiarly signifies a *building firmly*, a *rooting deep*, as that is opposed to *building on the sand*, to which nothing can be *fasten'd*. And that *David* at first did not build *thus firmly*, doth appear by his falling (even *deliberately*) in time of temptation. I adde no more, because you conclude, as you began with an ingenuous confession of what *you think*,

You say *you are willing to learn better that Doctrine that is according to Godliness, and to disclaim all that is against it. But I must not take your expressions of the worst that the mercy of God will cover in a man obedient in the main to be your descriptions of godly men*, Sect. 20.]

Sect. 20. You have told us over and over what crying sins may well *consist* with the power of *Godliness*. That *David* was not *unsanctified* or made *ungodly* by his *Adultery* and *Murder*, and *other* sins. Be pleased to reflect on what I have said in the *first Section* of this Chapter. And consider within your self, whether men may not be taught, by such expressions as you have used, to *believe* they may *deliberately* (as *David* did) commit *Adultery and Murder*, with divers *other abominations*, and yet be *godly*, *sanctified*, *spiritual men*. Can there be any thing in the world more *trecherous* to their *souls* then that opinion? since you are *willing to learn*, I hope the *horror* (of the Doctrine will teach you speedily *to disclaim it*.

The horror of a Doctrine should teach its vassals to disclaim it.

Again, I would know what you mean in this place by being *obedient in the main*. Is it for a man to be *obedient in more particulars* then those in which he is *disobedient*? or else in *mainer* or *greater* things? O remember the words of our Lord and Saviour: *Whosoever shall break one of these least Commandements, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the Kingdom of heaven*. And together with these, compare the words of S. *James*, *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point*, *he*

The equivocal refuge of being obedient in the main.

Mat. 5. 19.

Jam. 2. 10.

he is guilty of all. They that teach otherwise, are *blind leaders* of the *blind.* They cheat themselves and their Disciples. What is it then to be obedient in the *main*? Is it for the *main*, that is to say, the *greater* part of the life? sure that is not it, for we know it is possible a lesser part may serve turn. Or if that be all, then 'tis readily granted that *David* having liv'd *godly* before the matter of *Uriah*, and again very *godly* after *Nathan* came to him, he found acceptance with the Almighty. But what is this to the *interval* betwixt these two? David *the Murderer* and the *Adulterer*, is the man we now speak of. *David* the *just* and the *penitent* is of another consideration.

What was predominant in David when he deliberately sinned.

Bonum ex Causâ integrâ. Malum ex quolibet defectu.

Sect. 21. It is true what you adde, that *no Act will prove us holy, but a predominant Habit*, Sect. 20.] The reason is, because all circumstances are required to make a thing *completely good*; But then withall you must grant, that any *deliberate act of sin* will pronounce us *unholy*; Because the want of one circumstance is enough to name a thing *evil.* And he that offends in *one* point is guilty of *all*: but *David* offended in *more* then *two.* Again, *the estimation, election, resolution, operation of the Soul* cannot truly be said to be *predominant* to *good*, when the *deliberate acts* are quite contrary, transcendently *evil.* And a sad continuance in a sinful course (such undeniably was *David's*) is also as opposite to *Habits of Virtue.*

None in Adultery and murder can be really good men before the time of their repentance.

Sect. 22. What you adde of *blind unjust judgment*, (Sect. 20.) upon an Hypothesis of your own framing, concerns not *me*, in any measure. For did I ever speak of *judging the whole lives of men, by one hour, or one day, be it good or bad?* you know I did not. Yet *thus* we may judge, that that *hour*, or that *day*, wherein a man shall live both in *Adultery* and *Murder*, *without repentance* he can be no *good* man, nor in the *favour of God*, whatever he were before, or whatever he may be *after.* And remember that *David* had dwelt in sin, for a *year and a day*, (for ought appears in Holy Scripture) in

* Rom. 8. 8, 13.

sin

sin *deliberately* committed, and *not repented* of at all in so long a time.

Sect. 23. Now Sir, your Arguments being answered whereby you have laboured to beget a strong conceit in your easie Readers, that if a man is *once sanctified*, he cannot possibly be *otherwise*, notwithstanding *all* the *wickedness* that he can possibly commit, (an ample catalogue of which I have recited to you out of your self, in the *first Section* of this *Chapter*,) I beseech you to consider in the Spirit of meekness, whether your Doctrine is not as dangerous to the professors of Christianity, as that of Master *Pemble*, and Doctor *Twisse*, [*Of Christ's immediate actual delivering us from guilt, wrath, and condemnation*,] which you * profess to be *the very Pillar and Foundation of the whole Frame and Fabrick of Antinomianism*. And as you say a little *before*, † *that Socinianism were the soundest Doctrine, that Christ never needed to satisfie, if we were justified from eternity*; (to which you adde your confession, *that you remained long in the borders of Antinomianism, which you very narrowly escaped*;) so I intreat you to examine whether you are not already *fallen* into as *formidable* an error, as *that* is which you escaped.

The danger of the great error propos'd to consideration.

* *Appendix to Aphorisms of justif. p.* 164.

† *Ib. p.* 163.

There is a Book intitled, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, which hath dangerously *built* upon *your Foundation*, and is publickly *commended* by some of *your way*; Master *Cary*, Master *Burroughs*, Master *Strong*; Master *Sprigg*, and after all Master *Samuel Prittie*. *Evangelista* (in the Dialogue) being a Minister of the Gospel, doth instruct *Neophytus*, or the young Christian, in these following words: [*In case you be at any time by reason of the weakness of your Faith, and strength of your temptations drawn aside, and prevailed with, to transgress any of Christ's commandements, beware you do not thereupon take occasion to call Christ's love to you into question; but believe as firmly that he loves you as dearly as he did,*

What desperate Doctrines have been applauded by some of the ablest Presbyterians, no whit better then those of Wickliff.

See *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*, p. 101. Edit. 3.

before you thus transgressed; For this is a certain truth, as no good in you, or done by you, did or can move Christ to love you the more, so no evil in you, or done by you, can move him to love you the less.] Upon this bit of *marrow* (as the Author calls it) an idle Maid was found *chewing*; The very *sight* of which would overturn a *clean* stomach. For what scruple could she make of *transgressing any of Christ's Commandements* (whether *filching* for her *profit*, or playing the *wanton* for her *pleasure*, having been *taught* before hand, (and having *believed* what she was taught) *that Christ could love her nevertheless*: If this is *Divinity*, the Author did well to call it *Modern*, for nothing was like it in *Antiquity* except the Heresie of the *Gnosticks*, that I can think on. From what kind of *Bone* that *Marrow* was pick'd, and whether it had not some hand in the sins of these times, it will be revealed in *that day* when all hearts shall be opened. There are other things in that book, as † [*That the Law of Christ neither justifies nor condemns.* * *That in the Covenant betwixt Christ and his, there is no more for man to do, but onely to know and believe that Christ hath done all for them*;] which I suppose you disrellish as much as I, because you hold, that *the first sanctification is before justification*. For which perhaps some *Ignaro's* may have thought you a *Socinian*, (men no better advised then Master *Channel*) though you are able to cite for it Master *Richard Hooker*, and *Peter Martyr*, and the Reverend Doctor *Hammond*. Nay since I writ my last words, I find you * *excepting against that Book, as being guilty of hainous Doctrine, of notorious and dangerous mistakes; of denying the plain sense of the Text* (Mat. 10. 28.) *of intolerably abusing the Scripture, and making* Paul *a legal Preacher. Of shamefully abusing* 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10. *and of many other intolerable errors.* In which your just reprehensions, as I fully concur with you, (and in the most that you have written in those your *Aphorismes*) so I hope, in some time, you will concur in *mine* also. Had you considered that those Ministers, who so zealously *recommended* that venemous book unto

† Ibid. p. 161.
* Ibid. p. 119.

Saints Rest. part. 1. c. 8. Sect. 1. p. 158.

* Append. to Aphor. of just. f. p. 99. to p. 107.

unto the people, were some of the noted *London-preachers*, whom you exceedingly *commended*, (to wit in your Epistle before your *Treatise of Judgment*,) I do not think you would have done it *without a discrimination*. But now in faithfulness I must tell you, that not a few of those errors which you so worthily have condemned, do seem to flow from the *Principles*, which you *your self* have espoused, as well as *they*. And when the *Murderer of his bed-fellow* was taught by *some*, to * commend his sin for its *greatness*, as being a *rouzing, awakening*, yea a *sanctified sin*, a sin from which was *producible the eternal salvation of his soul*, the accidental *cause of a good fruit*, as that which *startled conscience, which would not with the noise of a lesser guilt be awakened*; 'tis easie to guesse at the *source* of so foul a *stream*. To conclude this subject, I can truly say with learned *Grotius*, that I am not an enemy, unless it be to those opinions, which I conceive to be enemies either to *piety* or *peace*. Such I take to be *that* of *Marlorate*, a *Calvinistical* Commentator, [That such sins as *David's, to wit, Adulteries and Murders, are not imputed to the elect.*] Such I take to be *that* which you have hitherto asserted, that *a man once justified can never fall*; That such sins as *David's* cannot *unsanctifie* the sinner; That a godly man may be a *Murderer*, an *Adulterer*, (and deliberately such) and yet *a godly man still, whilest yet impenitent*. A man is tempted by such a Doctrine to *live as he lists*, to commit as many sins as are grateful to him, and at the hour of death to *send for a Minister*, to *wish* his impious *deeds* had been *undon*, to *believe* the righteousness of Christ is *imputed* to him, and that so it must be even because he *believes* it. *With this Viaticum* (saith *Grotius*) *he flies up instantly into heaven*, if he does not go securely, and confidently to Hell. (For that you know must be the meaning of his *Antiphrasis*.) You well objected against the *Marrow of New Divinity*, that

* See *Parit. Murd.* printed *A.D.* 1657 *p.* 10, 11. & *p.* 13.

Hostis non sum, nisi eorum dogmatum, quæ credo noxia, aut pietati, aut Societati humanæ; &c. *Vot. pro Pace p.* 115.

Quæ est illa pœnitentia vivere ut lubet, deinde instante morte dicere ministro, *nollem factum*, & *credo justitiam Christi imputari*, idque verum esse *quia id credo*. Cum hoc Viatico statim ille in Cœlum avolat. *Id. ibid.*

1 Cor. 6. 9, 10. that *no unrighteous person, Fornicator, Adulterer, &c. shall inherit the Kingdom of God.* *David* was an *Adulterer*, and *before* he *repented* he was *impenitent*. Repentance and Reformation must go * before *pardon*. To be incapable of Heaven is to be somwhat *more* then *capable* of *Hell*. And were *David* alive upon the earth, he would not *endure* to hear his *sins apologized for* in such a manner, as might incourage the greatest sinners to the like *Apologies* for their *own*.

* This you acknowledge in *Append. to Apbor. p. 103.*

CHAP. IV.

Sect. 1. HAving done with the *Argument*, you fall upon the *person* with whom you deal. You bid me *trie whether in the very omission of some duties to my flock, or condemning of my brethren, &c. I may not have sins that are accompanied with as little love of God, as* David's *more disgracefull, and (materially haineous sins*, Sect. 20.]

A tacite and groundless accusation sadly reflecting on the Accuser.

Had I been a *Presbyterian*, I do not think you would have dealt so *foulely* with me, as to have hinted to your Readers some *strange omission* towards my *Flock*, when you *knew* that you *knew not* my least omission, and what an *omission* must that have been which could equall the guilt of *deliberate Murder and Adultery*? Had you known my *life* to have been any way *Reprovable*, what Tragical work would you have made, who could not here contain your self from such a *groundlesse insinuation*? Or who can be so inoffensive, whom you might not have used (or have *abused*) in like manner? As for the work of my Ministerie, when I consider the *weight* of *that*, how much I *owe* to the great *Shepherd and Bishop of our souls*, and how strict an account I am to render, I cannot but say I am an *unprofitable servant*, and am forced to take up that Apostolical *Protestis*, *who is sufficient for these things?* But when

1 Pet. 2. 25.

Luke 17. 10.

2 Cor. 2. 16.

when I consider mine own *weakneſſe*, and my endeavours to serve God with the poor *utmoſt* of my ability, and that God will *accept according to what a man hath*; when I examine all by that *Rule* in conformity to which we are bound to act: I can say to *you*, and to Master *Hickman*, (who hath also printed an *unhandsome*, indeed an *unmanlike* † *insinuation* in this kind) what Saint *Paul* did to *Felix*, † *Ye cannot prove those things whereof ye* (*vacisly*) *accuse me. But this I confess unto you, that after the way which some call hereſie*, (some superstition) *so worship I the God of my fathers.* And now I pray Sir consider whether I might not with greater reason have turn'd your *motion* upon *your self*, since you have given me (in * print) a perfect *knowledge* of *your failings*, in the discharge of *your Ministery*, whilest you have nothing concerning *mine*, but in your voluntary *surmisings*.

2 Cor. 8. 12.

† In his Preface to the Reader, p. 6.

† Act. 24. 13. 14.

* Saints Rest. edit. 2. part 3. p. 99.

You certifie to the world, that you are many times *lazy* in your performance: your words are these; [" * *It* " *is not a want of abilities that makes Ministers use Notes;* " *but it is a regard to the work and good of the hearers. I* " *use Notes as much as any man, when I take paine,* " *and as little as any man, when I am lazy, or busie,* " *or have not leisure to prepare. It is easier to preach* " *three Sermons without Notes, than one with them.*] If it is really *so*, as here you say, that the *using of Notes* is for the *good of the hearers*, and for the better performance of Gods *work*, then indeed I have been guilty of great *omissions* towards my *flock*: for in all the course of my Ministery, I never made any use of Notes. But I have this for my excuse, that I was charged *not* to use them, by very venerable persons, when I was first ordained to be a Preacher. And the reasons given for it were these especially; first because your *reading Preachers* were more *despised* at that time, then of late they have been, (and where the *Preacher* is not *valued*, the *Sermon* finds the less *attention.*) Next because such a Preacher as speaks out of his *memory*,

* One sheet for the Ministery, p. 13. & 14.

is better able to speak out of his *heart and mind*, then one who is *often*, or *altogether* forced to look into his book. Not will his work be so *lifeless*, as when he reads. He will not be so very apt to *preach his Auditory asleep*, (which you modestly condemn in your self and others.) But since you say the *use of notes* is for the *benefit of the hearers*, and since I know they are used by many eminent Preachers besides your self, I begin to suspect my former *judgment*, and perhaps may change my *practice* too. For as I never thought the worse of others whom I have known to use Notes, or the better of my self for having never us'd any, so have you given me an occasion to put my self on this question, whether I have not been faulty in bestowing *that time* to put my Sermons into my *memory*, which might better have been imployed in making them *worthy* to be *remembred*. I am really in a strait, and apt to state it in the *affirmative*; for he who spends his *whole time*, in giving *weight* and *worth* to his *compositions*, may make them useful for the *publick*, and fit to be preached from the *Press*; whereas the man that is obliged to speak *at large* upon a *little*, and to content himself with the *sudden effusions* of his soul, can attain to nothing beyond the *Pulpit*, where he speaks little else, then what must *perish* whilest it is *spoken*. I do intend (if God permit) to make a trial of *your way*; and if I shall find it to be the better, will never return unto *mine own*.

Of condemning brethren.

Sect. 2. If you mean by *my brethren*, the *Episcopal men*, who have not changed with the times, but (after all temptations to Apostacy) *have still contended for the Faith which was once delivered unto the Saints*, you know I never *condemned* them, but *cleared* them rather from their Accusers. If you mean by *my brethren*, the *Presbyterians*, I have condemnd them no farther then by their printed *blasphemies*, *confessions*, and *contradictions* they have *condemned one another*, & very often their *own selves*. I condemn'd *them* only, whom I caught in the *act* of many *scandalous sins*, such as you may see a good account of, both in my *universal discovery*

Jud. 3.

* See (in particular) *Introduct. p.* 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. *and the places there referred to.*

and

and *ἐαυτοτιμωρία*. I did carefully *distinguish* betwixt the *Rigid* and *Moderate* Presbyterians: I condemn'd the *former* out of their Writings; but the *later* I * declared to be of *their* number, whom *I do very unfeignedly both love and honour*, which I have also made apparent by my *inviolable friendship* with divers of them: in a word, I did *timely* preadmonish my Readers, (and your self as one of them,) That *my words cannot reach unto all Presbyterians indiscriminately, but to such and such onely, of whom the Authors by me cited are found to speak. That what I say from the History of Master* Knox, *I mean of those whom Master* Knox *himself meant, who was a Chieftain of the Party. That when I name* Paræus, Buchanan, Hacket, *and the like, it is plain I mean them. If when no body is named, any one or more persons shall name themselves,* (as one in the World hath very publickly done) *and apply my words to their particulars, which I had left onely in common,* (*to be seized on by none but the proper owners*) *they will be in that case their own Accusers.*

† See Ch. 3. p. 73. 77. 80 p. 83.

* At the end of my premisition to my ἐαυτοτ.

And now that you see how I am innocent, observe how *ill* you were qualified for my *Accuser*. For if you reckon, amongst your *brethren*, the *regular sons of the Church of England*, you have *condemned* them *more* then any man I ever heard of; and *reviled* them even for *that*, for which their *Reward will be great in heaven*. To repeat your *bitterness*, not onely to your *Brethren*, but to your *right Reverend Fathers* and *Superiours*, who are *over you in the Lord*, were to write a large volume in this one Paragraph. It shall suffice me to put you in mind what wants of charity you have shew'd in your *Reformed Pastor*, in your *Christian Concord*, and (not to rake into all your books) in your *Grotian Religion from* p. 109. *unto the end*; what your charity was to *Grotius*, hath been shewn *already*; and what to *me*, will be seen *anon*. If you mean by your *Brethren*, the several *Sectaries* of the *times*, you have *condemned* them *all*, as they have *all* condemned *you*, (the *Presbyterians* not excepted.) Of very *many* instances, I shall detain you but with a *few*. You have condemned

The accuser is the most criminal.

Mat. 5. 12. Luk. 6. 23.

Heb. 13. 17.

Master *Colyer*, *Sprigg*, and *Hobson*, for abominable *Pamplets*. And all the *approvers* of the *Marrow of Modern Divinity*. You have highly condemned both Doctor *Twiss* and Master *Pemble*, as hath been shew'd. † Nay *many of your Divines are condemned by you, for fighting against Jesuites and Arminians, with the Antinomian weapons, and for running thereby into the* WORSE EXTREME. Having called *Maccovius an excellent Doctor*, you yet profess to be *ashamed to confute so* * *senseless an Assertion* as his is. After Master *Tombes* had condemned you for a *Railer*, † you did condemn *him* also of *stark brazen-faced and unconscionable dealing*, *grosser then you had found in any Jesuite*; * *of playing the Devils part, yea worse, yea very far worse in several respects then if it were the Devil that did it*; † *of covetousness, liberty in sinning*, and many more things then I have leisure to repeat. You have *condemned* your own men, (whom you call the *Godly*) * for *disobedience to their guides in these times, for Schisme, and for doing much hurt to the Church*. Nay you have publickly condemned your own *long-Parliament*, and your whole *Assembly of Divines*, for the iniquities of their (a) *Solemne League and Covenant*, and of their *Directory*, of their too great *enmity* to *Episcopacy*, of their (b) *cruelty and injustice* to *Episcopal men*, of their (c) discarding the *practice of Confirmation*, and of their contentions for *Presbyterie*, which you declare against as (d) *unscriptural*, in a great part of it, which as I have in part made *bare* already, so I shall do it more largely in due time and place. Lastly speaking of your *Antagonists*, who were especially *Presbyterians* [(e) *You marvel what's the matter that the Wasps of the Nation are gathered about your ears.*]

Sir, You see my fair dealing in laying no more to your *charge*, then I have cited your *Writings* for; and I have done it so much the rather, because you have charged me in *general*, without producing the *least proof*; which was so *unhansome* a dealing with me, that I have shew'd you (by my example) how you *ought* to have dealt with your very *enemies*, of whom you *confessed that I was none*. Yet mark how you proceed— [*You*

Append. to Apho. p.99.

† *Ibid.p.163, 164.*

* *Ibid.147.*
† *See your history of the Conception and Nativity of your book intitled Plain Scripture proof &c.*
* *Ibid.p.174. Edit.1.p.175.*
† *Ib.p.202, 203.*
* *Disp.3. of Sacram.p.330.*
(a) *See Edit.3. of your plain Script.proof, &c. p.120, 121, 122, 123. and Append. to Aphor.p.107.*
(b) *Grot.Relig. p.111, 112.*
(c) *Plain Script. proof.p.120. 122.*
(d) *Ibid.227. 228.*
(e) *Disp.5. of Sacr.p.516.*

[*You little suspect that the uncharitable passages in this very learned book of yours, are as probable a symptome of the absence of charity, as the sin of* David *or* Peter *was.* Sect.20.]

*Sect.*3. Thus again you *affirm*, without the least shew of *proof*, that there is *any* want of charity in any *one* the *least* passage throughout that book; unless you can think it a *want* of charity to *others*, that I had *some* for *my self* in confuting some *calumnies* then cast upon me. And I can *now* evince mine *innocence* (as to that whereof I was *accused*) from the very *handwritings* of my *Accusers*. But having received some satisfaction (and a *little* of *that* will serve my turn when I am *wronged*) I will not *causelessly revive*, what I have long since *buried* with my *forgiveness*. So little do you oblige me by calling my book *very learned*, whilest you also call it very *uncharitable*, that as soon as you have upbraided *my* wants of charity, you do immediately compell me to tax *your own*.

Wants of charity examin'd, & found to be in the Accuser.

For you shut up your Section with these incomparable expressions [*If I must needs chuse one of the two, I had rather die in the state of* David *before* Nathan *spake to him*, (which was a state of Impenitence added to Murder and Adultery) *then of Mr.* Pierce *who hath committed no such sin, &c.* Sect.20.]

*Sect.*4. Twice I have told you of this already, but very *briefly*; and till you seriously *repent*, you cannot be told of it *too often*. Yet will I not grieve you with *repetition*, but onely *adde* those things which may probably convince you of your *unkindness*. I cannot better introduce it, then by shewing you first your * *partiality*, for very *remarkable* is the *difference* betwixt your dealings with *me*, and with *other men*. I was apparently the *friendliest* of all the *Opponents* you ever met with, for *you acknowledge my gentleness and charity, my brotherly and moderate dealing with you.* Sect.4.] Yet because you find me an *Episcopal Divine*, (for what other reason can be imagined) you are pleased to judge *more hardly* of me, then of the *bitterest Presbyterians* that have ever rail'd at you. Reflect (if you please)

* Look forwards on *ch.*3. *Sect.*22.

please) on a few Examples. [1] When *Dr.* Owen *had affirmed in sundry particulars, that you and the* Worcestershire *profession of Faith give too great a countenance to the* Socinian *abominations*, you said no worse of him than that *his passion had quite conquered his ingenuity.* [2] Your censure of Master *Blacke* was much less terrible then this of *me*, when yet *you put him into tears and trembling.* [3] When Mr. *Crandon* called one of your Principles *most blasphemous*, and professed *to abhor it with greatest detestation, and indignation*, you did only call him *judicious Pedagogue.* [4] Nay *you hope that such men as Mr.* Robertson, *are justified, whose works* (you say) *are such as you once hoped no man had been guilty of that had the least fear of God before his eyes.* [5] When D. *Kendal* jeer'd you for setting so high a price on the *Freshmens* books, & for being *said to be ἀνοσφίδαλος, as if you scarcely had been bred in either University*; and added also to this, *that somewhat more of the University would have done you no harm*: the worst you said of him, was, *That you would not come near him, until his breath smelt sweeter.* But a man may be in a present *state of salvation*, for all his *ill-smelling breath*; which no man can be thought to be, whose state is *worse* then *David's* was, before *Nathan spake to him.* Yet this is the censure you fix on *me*, whom *alone* you had *acknowledged, to have dealt very brotherly and gently* with you.

[1] Disp. 5. of Sacram. p. 487.
[2] Ibid. p. 489.
[3] Ibid. p. 517.
[4] Ib. p. 516.
[5] D. Kendal's Answer to Mr. Goodw. ch. 4. p. 143, 144.

Sect. 5. If you so very much *abhor* the dying in such a state as *mine*, how much less can I be *willing* to die in *yours*? for although you have professed, * *you take your self to be a Saint*, (whilest you say *you have reason to take your self for the least*; almost as modestly as S. *Paul*, who thought fit to say, that he was *less then the least*;) yet you openly † *confess* in another volume, that *you are guilty of pride and prejudice*; * *that you are conscious to your self of being proud and selfish.* You say *you must and will confess the truth of that accusation from D.* Owen; *that* † *you were aware of pride and hypocrisie in your heart before he told you of them.* So you say to Mr. *Tombes* (p. 272, 281.) that *your heart hath pride in every work you take in hand, and that your heart is mortally or desperately wicked.* Again you confess (in your Preface to that Book) *how loth you were to publish the later part of your third*

The Accuser's character of himself.
* One sheet for the Ministery, p. 11.
ἐλαχιστότερος Eph. 3. 8.
† Disp. 5. of Sacr. p. 482.
* Ibid. p. 486.
† Ibid p. 484.

Dispu-

Disputation, which shews what sins do consist with godliness, as knowing how unfit it was for the eyes of the profane, yet you have printed it with a witness, and affirm'd that *such* sins do consist with *godliness*, as I have cited out of your text, in the *first Section of my third Chapter*: worse sins then which, it is hard to name. And notwithstanding you do acknowledge, that *Sabbath-breaking in* England *is taken for a sin inconsistent with grace*, yet you positively affirm, that *every one is not ungodly, who lives and dies in that sin without particular repentance*. You confess in that page, that *spiritual pride is worse then common swearing*, and you elsewhere confess that you are *spiritually proud*. You * confess that *you go on in the same fault your self*, for wch you had accused the *pride and ignorance of others*; professing *you have no excuse or argument, but those of the times*, NECESSITY *and* PROVIDENCE. Sir, I think the *better* of you, for ingenuously *confessing* such sins as these, but *not* the better that you *commit* them; and heartily pray you to believe that they stand in need of *a particular repentance*. Concerning *me* you know nothing, but that I have written against *sin*, and so (by necessary consequence) against such *sinners* as *patronize* it, yet you implicitly pronounce me in a *state of damnation*. If *this* is one of those sins wch you will have to consist wth the *power of godliness*, your danger cannot but be the greater, by how much the likelier you are to fancie that it stands not in need of a *particular repentance*. Compare your *censoriousness* in relation to *me*, with what you are more guilty of in the later pages of your book, & in the pages before cited from out your *Saints everlasting rest*: though you are clearly a *guiltier* person then the Episcopal men whom you *condemn*, yet I will not judge *you*, as you judge *others*. I had rather for mine own part, have a *Mill-stone tied about my neck*, and to be *cast into the sea*, then take upon me to be *a judge of quick and dead*, by parting the *tares* from the *wheat* before the *harvest*. Some will justifie the *wicked*, as vessels of *absolute election*, because they stick to their party, and *condemn the righteous* as moral men, for at least *as bad*, if not a *worse* reason, which is to interpret God's *secret* will, in *opposition* to his *revealed* one. I will not resemble them so far, as to judge of their *end*, though

Disp. 3. p. 330.

* See your Epistle to the poor in spirit prefixt to your directions for peace of Conscience.

though I see their *way*; For *secret things belong to God, & spiritus ubi vult spirat.* And though *late Repentance* is seldom *true*, yet *true Repentance* is sometimes *late*. It is to their *Master* they stand, or fall. I judge not of *any* man, but by his *fruits*; nor any otherwise by his *fruits*, but by the *Rule revealed*.

His obligation to recant, if not resolutely mischievous.

Sect.6. Your next short Section being nothing but a *Reference* to what you have said in *another Book*, I have nothing to do but to circumscribe. Not understanding what you mean by the last words of it, [*That that is it you yet stand to.*] For if you *retract* what you have *taught* in your *Disputation* concerning *Sacraments*, and will now *stand to nothing* but what you have said to Master *Tombes*, and in the other places which you refer to, (as the Particle [*yet*] doth somwhat seem to imply,) I shall only intreat you to do it *plainer*. But if you stand to what you have *said* in the place *by me cited*, I also stand to my *exceptions*, and am not concerned to look out farther. Your *judgment* cannot be mistaken touching the *sins of the godly*, when you have told us so very plainly that *godly* men may be *Drunkards*, and *live a long time in Swearing*, yea, in *Rebellion* and *Schism*, and other *Crimes*, and yet you do *not doubt* of their being *godly*. You had said *enough*, had you said no more then that you would rather chuse to *die* in the *state* of *David* (whilest yet *impenitently lying in Adultery and Murder, and other deliberate impieties*) then in the state of an Episcopal Divine, (naming *me*) whom you acknowledge to be *free* from *any* such *sin*. Whereby you put me in mind of the aforesaid * Malefactor, who after his *Thievery* and *adulteries*, and *deliberate murder of his Bedfellow*, *did pity the ignorance and blindness of those his Visitants, who offer'd to aggravate his bloody fact, and ask'd him whether the sight of the baggs* (for after his Murder he stole two purses, containing 120 *l.*) *were not his first temptation to the murdering of his brother.* He did ill requite them for their faithfulness to his soul, who knew it was needful to *cleanse* the wound with some *corrosives*, before it could safely be *closed up*. Their question was very pertinent, for he once con-

* Nathanael Butler in the Narrative of him, p.8.

confessed the money tempted him, (p. 3, 4.) yet this poor Malefactor (if Master *Case* hath not wrong'd him) was taught the confidence to *bewail* his Monitors *ignorance* and *blindness*. To which he added (saith Master *Case*) that *they who never had committed such gross and scandalous sins, are accounted as guilty of all sins before God, and as uncapable of heaven, as if they had committed them in the highest degree*; these he also *bewailed* as poor *Ignaro's*, as if *original corruption* were *more* powerful in *them* who *never* committed such hainous sins, then in *him* who had committed them in the very *worst* manner: or as if *their natures* were not as *likely* to have been *changed* and *renewed*, who had *abstained from fulfilling their fleshly lusts*, as *his* who had been so *indulgent* to them. Or as if it were not the *Grace of God*, (which the Murderer called the *restraining power*) whereby others are preserved from such *foul sins*. Its true indeed Master *Tearwood* did very prudently endeavour to keep the sinner from *presumption*, (a *sin* the more to be avoided because it is commonly swallowed down under the notion of *assurance*, and so dispatches too many souls very *comfortably* to Hell,) even by seasoning his ears with this great truth, *that* David *himself if he murders, is in danger of damnation*, (p. 11.) But now suppose that Malefactor was indeed a *true Penitent*, and that it was not *presumption* but *saving Faith*, which made him say, *he did not doubt of his salvation*; and so (by a consequence unavoidable) that he was one of the *Elect*, as well as *David*; (as for ought we know he was) will you say that his *crimson and scarlet sins* were no more then the *sins of a godly man?* and that they could *never* once place him in a *state of Damnation*, before the instant of his Repentance? if you say *yes*, consider whether it *sends*; if you say *no*, you yield the cause, and are obliged to publish your Recantation.

{ 1 Pet. 2. 11. Rom. 13. 14. Gal. 5. 16.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Sect. 1. I Am now arriv'd at the *largest subjects* of Discourse, on which notwithstanding I shall endeavour to say the *least*. My reasons for it are chiefly these, First because I am inform'd that others will handle them *ex professo*, who are qualified for it, by *greater leisure* then I enjoy. Next because I am called upon to *undeceive* the admirers of Master *Hickman*, who may perhaps turn *Libertines*, if they are not speedily *disabused*. These especially are the reasons why I shall labour for *brevity* in all that *follows*.

You say, *Tis strange that in an Age, which knows the lives of those that I am for, and against, I can make it the ground of opposing Puritanes, because their Doctrines lead men to licentiousness, and destroy godliness. And that* Grotius *saith the same.* Sect. 22.]

The Puritans lives no better then their doctrines.

Sect. 2. A thousand to one but it is true, if *Grotius* saith it, who had one of the sobarest and most discerning spirits that the World hath known in many Ages. Nor is truth the *less* truth by being spoken by *me*, as well as *Grotius*. If you include *your self* in their number, whom you commend for *godly living*, how differ *your* words from those of the *Pharisee*? *Lord I thank thee that I am not as other men are.* Nay if you speak of *those Puritanes* of whom I speak, it is just as if the *Publican* should take up the words of the *Pharisee*, in stead of those which are fitter for him, *Lord be merciful to me a sinner*. For the *lives* of those whom *I am against*, are well nigh as *ill*, as the Divel can *wish* them; *Blasphemous*, *Rebellious*, *Sacrilegious*, *Perjurious*, *Schismatical*, and all in *publick*; what they are *secretly*, God onely knows: But then the *fathering* of all these sins *on God*, and committing them under pretence of *Godliness*, and the not allowing them to be *sins*, must needs be the greatest *aggravation* and *heightning* of them. And why should not this become a *ground*, (both with *Grotius*, and

Luk. 18. 11.

Vers. 13.

and *my self*,) whereby to conclude of *their Doctrines*, that they *lead to licentiousness, and destroy godliness*? Although I cannot call to mind that I branded the *Puritanes* with those expressions, and had you seen any such words, you should have noted my *page* wherein you *saw* them. I think you *would*, had you been *able*, or had you thought it for your *advantage*.

Sect.3. Whereas you say, *that their lives are so much better, then their Doctrines* (Sect.22.) It is enough for me to say, *you do but say it*, you offer *no proof* that so it *is*. If your particular life is *better* then others of your party, it is but agreeable to your *doctrines*, which are (most of them) *better* then those of your party, and for which they have proclaim'd you a great *Arminian*. But whether your life is so, or not, I will leave it to *God* to be *determined*: of this I am sure, that when you had fastened on Mr. *Tombes* (one of the *authorized Triers*) as ugly a character as was possible (throughout your book) and on the men of his way, yet you professed that *those things do not diminish your affection to him*. And why so? your reason runs in these words— [*Because I find we are all naught, even almost stark naught, and that Saints have less sanctity and more sin in them, then ever I imagined, &c.*] Let *some* men sin never so *much*, they do not *cease* to be *Saints*, but onely grow to be *naughty* Saints. Let others sin never so *little*, (as to the eye of the World) they do not *cease* to be *ungodly*, but onely grow to be *moral and civil men*. If it is true (what you have told us) that your *heart is desperately, mortally wicked*, and that you are *conscious to your self of being Proud*, *and Selfish*, *and Hypocritical*, you doe not well to call your self *the least of Saints*, whilest you make us believe that you are *no Saint at all*.

Their partialit, to their own Tribe.

Plain Script. proof. &c. Edit.1.p.281.

As for the *lives* of those men, whom *I am for*, they are such as are for *God*, and for his *persecuted spouse*, for the *keeping of Promises and Oathes, although it be* (outwardly) *to their hurt*; they are such, whose great *learning*

The contrary lives of Anti-puritanes: Psal.15.4.

is far inferiour to their *lives*; such whose enemies are not able to defame them without calumnie; such, whose *converse* is so *unblameable*, that their enemies confess they are *moral* men, and are fain to tell them *they have not grace in their hearts*, because they see nothing in their *actions* which is *ungracious*. In a word, they are such, *who rather chuse to suffer affliction with the people of God, then to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season*. If there are any who are *not such*, I never *was* for them, I never *will* be; yet *scandalous livers* may suffer *wrong* in some cases, wherein 'tis a *duty* to plead their *right*.

Heb. 11. 25.

You say, that *Fitz. Simmons a petulant Jesuite, divideth us English Protestants into Formalists and Puritanes, and inveigheth against the Puritanes as their greatest enemies. You were sorry that mine did use so much of his language, and that the Jesuite and his formalists should accord about so bad a work*. Sect. 23.]

The Accuser's concurrence with the Jesuite.

Sect. 4. Here you argue against *me*, and your *self*, and not at all against *me*, unless against your *self* also; for you confess that the *Jesuite* doth call the men of my way by the name of *Formalists*, in which calumniating language you do fully *close* with him. If I must be blamed for using *one* word, which is also used by a *Jesuite*, much more must *you*, Sir, who *accord* with a *Jesuite* in *another*. I say much more, because you *do*, what you *condemn*. And is not *Formalist* as *scandalous*, as *reproachful* a title to the *Prelatists*, as *Puritane* is to the *Presbyterians*? nay do not you use it as a word of *obloquy*? then mark the summe of the whole matter. Master *Baxter* may freely declaim against *Prelatists*, (that is, the *regular* sons of the *Church of England*,) calling them *Formalists*, *Arminians*, *Cassandrian Papists*, or *what he pleases*. But Master *Pierce* must not dare to say there is any such *thing*, or *name*, as *Puritane* in the World. It were *better his right hand were used as* Cranmer's, (Sect. 24.) It were *better he were in the state of* David *before* Nathan *came to him*, (Sect. 20.) What a *priviledge* is this, that you must have the *inclosing* of *contumelious language* unto

your

your self? If mine were *such*, you are not fit to be my *Reprover*, but I have shewed you that mine was *none*.

Sect. 5. Be it so, that *Fitz Simmons* did rail against *Puritanes* as his *greatest enemies*, (though you cite no *page* where that is visible) what do you mean to prove by it? that the *Puritanes* are really his greatest *enemies?* then all is true that *Fitz Simmons* saith. But if they really are *not*, *Fitz Simmons* lies, which sure he *may*, being a *Jesuite*, especially if he holds their prodigious Doctrine of *Probability*. The *Jesuists* use to say *that*, which is most for their *turn*; and tis for cunning mens *interest* to rail at them *most*, that do them *most service*: which the *Puritanes* certainly have done, in *destroying*, or *suppressing* the greatest *enemies* of the *Papists*, the unchangeable men of the Church of *England*. For this I have frequently your own *confession*: You say the *Papists had a hand in casting out of our Bishops*, p.95. *and in the killing of our King*, p.106.108. Do men endeavour the *destruction* of their *enemies* or their *friends?* Again you say, *that the Papists are crept in among all sects; Quakers, Seekers, Anabaptists, Millenaries, Levellers, Independents, and* * *Presbyterians*, p. 99,100. To what end, but to *cherish* and *abet* each Sect? Do men *cherish* and *abet* their *greatest enemies*, or their *friends?* It hath indeed been the *cunning* of certain *Papists* to pretend great kindness to *Episcopal men*, nay, to the XXXIX *Articles* of the *Church of England*, (of which you have *Franciscus de Sancta Clara* for an Example) nay to whisper among the people, that *his Grace of* Canterbury *was a Papist*; nay farther to offer him a *Cardinall's Hat*, or any thing else in the World, to make it believ'd that the *Prelatists* were *Popishly affected*; that as *such* they might be *hated*, and so *destroyed*. Consider how you have *help'd* them in this *design*, and then I shall hope you will do so no more. Consider also the *insufficiencie* of your arguing, and abstain from such arguing for time to come. Your self (at one time or other) have inveigh'd against *all*, and yet you would be thought to be hardly an enemy unto *any*. The *Jansenians* and the *Jesuites* do *inveigh* against each other

Fitz Simmons *his Artifice discovered, and the Puritanes serviceableness to the Papists.*

* *For this last you cite the News book.*

other, as much as may be, yet *both* against *Protestants*, for *both* are *Papists*. *Salmasius* inveighed against our *English Presbyterians*, as the worst creatures to be imagined, and yet himself was no *Papist*, or *Episcopal Divine*, but a more peaceable *Presbyterian* then those against whom he had whet his pen. You might have saved me the labour of this whole Section, had you consider'd what I said on the like occasion in *page* 98. *Chapt.* 3. of Καυλοτριμμάτων.

You say, *I was to blame that I would not give you my description of a* Puritane, *that you might know my meaning; & that a* Puritane *is not the same thing to one man as to another: whereupon* you reckon up your *several notions* of a *Puritane*, §. 23.

King James his description of a Puritane.

Sect. 6. As you do not cite any *page* wherein I used the word *Puritane*, so I suppose if you had done it, you could not have spoken what now you speak: for I cannot remember that I ever used that word, when I did not abundantly unfold my *meaning*, even as much as you have done, when you have spoken of *Papists*, or *Presbyterians*, of which you know there are *many sorts*. How many *sorts* are there of *Independents*, of whom you many times speak, without declaring distinctly *which sort* you *mean*? Yet it appears by my writings, that I have meant by *Puritanes*, what was meant by King *James*, with whom you confess that a *Puritane* was a *turbulent seditious Seperatist*, or *Non-Conformist*. But you might have confessed much *more*, had you been pleas'd, for he * called them the *unruly, and phanatick spirits among the Ministery, as bad as Highland or Border Thieves for Ingratitude, Lies, and vile Perjuries*. When you say *he meant not all Presbyterians*, you do infer, he *meant some*, and more then *some* I never meant; nay, I often professed I meant *not all*. But *which*, and how *many Presbyterians* were understood by King *James*, you may collect by *two Books* already printed, my *Divine Purity defended*, *chap.* 2. *p.* 8. 9. and my *Self-Revenger Exemp.l. chap.* 3. *p.* 71. *to p.* 84. of which your *Grotian Religion* doth take no notice. The truth is, the word *Puritane* was brought hither out of *Scotland* (I think I am not mistaken, though if I am, its no great matter,) and

* Bac. Δεῖξ.

and so King *James* was the fittest *definer* of them, though their name was in the World before his time, *viz.* Anno Dom. 1564. So that after it was evident I spake of *such*, what needed the *muster* of so many *other notions?* yet to give you satisfaction, I shall speak to *each* of them.

You say, *With a Papist a Puritane was a zealous Protestant*, &c. Sect. 23.]

Sect. 7. If that doth signifie a *firm*, or a *constant Protestant*, who building upon rational and *truly Catholick grounds*, is not onely *no Papist*, but never *can* be; then the notion of *Puritane* belongs to no other *Protestants* then those you commonly call *Prelatists* and *Episcopal men*. But if by *zeal* is meant *violence, ignorance, noise and virulence*, or calling the Pope the *Whore of Babylon*; then it belongs to those men who declaim against Bishops, as *Antichristian*; and against a publick *Form of Prayer*, as a *stump of Dagon*. And so the *soberest* of the *Papists* do call them *Puritans* who are enemies to *Protestants* as well as *Papists*. You know who they are that are thus intitled to the *word*: and for those of King *James*, I have accounted to you already.

What Puritane signifies with the Papists.

You say, *With some Protestants, a Puritane is one of the old Catharists, that think a man may be perfect without sin in this life, as* Grotius *and the* Papists *do*, &c. Sect. 23.]

Sect. 8. But could you not tell us *what Protestant* hath used the word as you say? or could you not tell in *what writings* either *Grotius* or the *Papists* have held such Doctrine, as that a *man* in this life may be *without sin?* you often lay too great a weight upon your *private fancy*, or *bare assertion*; perhaps indeed some of the *Papists* may have said of the ever blessed *Virgin*, that *she* was free from all sin in this present world; but she was a *woman*, and therefore cannot be the *man* you are pleas'd to speak of. Nay are you sure the *old Catharists* did ever teach any such thing? I doubt you are not. Bishop *Andrews* call'd the *Catharists*, *Puritanes*, inferring the *Puritanes* to be a new sort of *Catharists*; but for quite *other reasons* then you here fancy, as I shall shew you at large in my *following Sections*.

A mistake of the old Catharists, *who yet were* Puritanes *before the word was fitted to the thing.*

The

The *Scripture notion* of the word [*Perfect*] you must acknowledge doth belong to divers men in this life, it being ascribed both to *Zachary*, and to *Elizabeth* his wife. But such *perfection* is one thing, and *sinlesness* is another.

Grotius *groundlessly calumniated a-gainst.*

Your bidding me *take heed least by vindicating* Grotius *I make folks believe I am a Puritane my self*, (ibid.) is a most groundless intimation, that all the vindicaters of *Grotius* do make *themselves*, or *some others*, to be *without sin*, which, what a *calumny* it is, I need not tell you. At first you bid me take heed, lest by vindicating *Grotius* I be suspected to be a *Papist*; if now a *Puritane* too, my case is hard, especially when *Grotius* himself was *neither*, for the vindicating of *whom*, I must be suspected to be *both*. Perhaps *your brethren* did call *you Papist* for the very same reason, even because you have appear'd in *vindication* of *Grotius*, and taught that the *righteousness* of a Christian (even in this present life) *is either perfect, or none at all.* In *this* you have spoken as high as *Grotius*, see if you have not, [*Aphoris. of justif. Thes.*24.*p.*129.& 133.& *Thes.* 22.*p.*122.123.*Thes.*27.*p.*141.*Saints Rest part.*4. *p.*296.] What I have * spoken for *Castellio*, to that I refer for *you*, and *Grotius*.

* *Self Revenger*, ch.1.p. 35, 36, 37.

You say, *with the old Episcopal party, a Puritane was a Non-conformist*, Sect.23.]

What the Puritanes were with the old Episcopal party.

*Sect.*9. And glad I am of the *Confession*, for 'tis not long, since that party was the *prevailing*, and so had the *Normans loquendi* abiding with it: which being granted, what need we more to discover the *vulgar use* of the word *Puritane*? If you consider the *ill things* which *Non-conformist* doth import, (*a schismatick*, *Bonteseux*, *a strainer at Gnats*, *and a swallower of Camels*,) you have not spoken much amiss. And as touching the *late Prelates*, How (good Sir,) doth it appear that *they* had any *other notion*? you bring just *nothing* to prove they *had*: and I can bring *something* to prove they had *not*. For Bishop *Carleton* could say, (even then when he endeavour'd to speak in their favour, or excuse) that *Puritanes were* † *disquiters of the Church*,

† *This is confessed by Master* Hickman, *p.*40.

Church, about their conceived Discipline. * Master *Fuller*, to the word *Discipline*, doth adde *Church-Government*, from which the *Puritanes* dissented in *former time*. And he saith, *in probability* the word imported *Non-conformists*. To the other two words you now adde *Doctrine*; and what an *unruly* sort of people must *they* have needs been, who were ever *snarling* and *disquieting* the Church of God (in which they lived) for her *Discipline*, and *Government*, and *Doctrine* too? Our Learned and Reverend Doctor *Sanderson* you do *professedly reverence* in very great measure, (p. 2.) and whether you do esteem him a *new Prelatist*, or an *old one*, it will equally be to my advantage. First see him * citing the *old Prelatists* concerning *Puritanes*, and then together with *their* judgments, compare his *own*. [" The Reverend *Archbishop Whitgift*, and " the learned *Hooker*, men of great judgement, and famous in their times, did long since *foresee*, and declare " their *fear*, that if ever *Puritanism* should prevail among " us, it would draw in *Anabaptism* after it. At this *Cartwright*, and other Advocates for the *Disciplinarian Interest in those dayes*, seemed to take *great offence*, &c. " but without reason saith Doctor *Sanderson*: † for those " *Godly men*, (meaning *Hooker* and the *Archbishop*,) were " neither so *unadvised*, nor so *uncharitable*, as to become " Judges of other mens *thoughts* or *intentions*, beyond " what their *actions* spoke them; they onely considered as " prudent men, that *Anabaptisme* had its *rise* from the " same *Principles* the *Puritanes* hold, and its *growth* from " the same *courses* they took; together with the natural " *tendency* of those *Principles* and *Practices* thitherward. " And that it was no *vain fear*, the unhappy *event* hath " proved, and *justified* them, since what they *feared* is " come to *passe*, and that in a very high degree.] Thus you see that *Presbyterians*, and the prime of that party, even such as Master *Cartwright* (in Queen *Elizabeth's* dayes) were stiled *Puritanes*, and *Disciplinarians* by these *unquestionable* men. And I wish you would read (once at least every week) that most excellent Preface of

* p. 99.

* *Preface to the fourth Edit. of of his first Sermons, Sect. XXIII.*

The judgment of Archbishop Whitgift *and judicious* Hooker *concerning* Puritans.

† *Doctor* Sanderson's *judgment of the same.*

See Sect. XVII. and compare it with XXI. where he saith *the right* English Protestant *is in the middle between the* Papist *and the* Puritan.

of Doctor *Sanderson*: you will find him placing the *Church of England*, and the *regular sons of the Church of England*, in the middle betwixt the *two extremes*, *Papists* and *Puritanes*; highly applauding the *Episcopal Divines* as the *greatest enemies of* Rome, *and converters of Papists from that Church to this, which hardly ever a Presbyterian was known to be.* You will find him shewing how *your party* have been the *great promoters of the Roman interest among us, and that by many more waies then one.* You will

Sect. XVIII.

find him confuting your Book of *Concord.p.46.* shewing how *you and your brethren have hardened the Papists, and betrayed the Protestant cause.* Nay how *Libertinism it self hath overspread the whole face of the land, by the means of*

Sect. XX.

fiery turbulent Presbyterians. You will find him discovering that *dangerous point, wherein the very mysterie of Puritanism consisteth* (they are his own words) *and from whence as from a fountain so many acts of sinful disobedience issue.*

Sect XXIII.

How the *enemies* of our *Prelacy* are both *multiplied*, and *divided* into *Fractions*, and *Factions*, not more *opposite* to *truth* (many of them) then to *one another*: *their opposition to the Truth being the onely property wherein the Factions do*

Ibid.

all agree. Yea you will find him express his *fears* (which are extremely to be heeded, proceeding from so *good*, and so *wise* a man.) that our *Atheists are more numerous then either our* Papists *or our Sectaries*, (and perhaps go masking in all their *vizors*) since the pretended *Reformation* you so much talk of. To put an end to this Paragraph,

Sect. XXIV.

you will find him *distinguishing*, as I have many times done, (as well *before*, as *since* he did it,) between the *moderate*, *and the rigid, Scotized, through-paced Presbyterians.* The *former* he professeth to *love* and *honour*: but such he saith the *madness and obstinacy* of the *later*, *that it is vain think of doing any good upon them by Argument*. But becaus you may object that Doctor *Sanderson* is one of the *m Episcopal Divines*, or say of *him* (as you did of *Grotius*) tha he is an *exasperated man*, (as having been *cast* out of hi *own* by the barbarous violence of *your Reformers*) I will ad some judgments, to which you *cannot* have such exceptions

Sect. 10

Sect. 10. Bishop *Andrews* (of blessed memory) hath described a *branch of the old* Cathari *or* Puritanes, *who call themselves* Apostolici, *for an extraordinary desire (above other men) to have discipline, and all things to the exact pattern of the Apostles dayes.* He citeth *Epiphanius* for the *Catharists* (Hæresi 61.) so that it seems he thought *Puritanes* a sort of *Heretick revived.* He calls it fitly *Cacozelia, an apish imitation, to retain all in use then, seeing divers things even then were onely temporary.* He also shews them to be *a parcel of the* Donatists, *for pressing all things alike* which they found in Scripture. *Both which* (he tells us) *have not a little harmed the Church.* * He discovers their *Hypocrisie and Superstition* (so unfit are the *Puritanes* to accuse others of it) *with another riot and licentious liberty, which* (he saith) *is a great deal worse then the former.* In a word, he doth conclude them to be partly *Idols*, and partly *Idolaters*; † for besides their *vain imaginations* touching the *Apostles fellowship*, (*Lay-Elders* and the rest of the *Presbyterian* inventions) *to which* (he saith) *a great number of the deceived people bow down and worship*, (p. 34.) and besides their *babling after the manner of the* Papists, *yea, of the Heathen*, in their *long* and (pretendedly) *extemporary prayers*, (in wch he saith *they err no less* then either *Papists* or the *Heathens* do, p. 37.) He concludes of all their tricks *together*, wch he condemned in *particular* throughout his Sermon, [*These are of many imaginations, some set up and magnified by some, and by others worshipped and adored, under the names of the Apostles* [1] *Doctrine*, [2] *Government*, [3] *Sacraments*, [4] *Prayers.*] In divers others of his Sermons he sets them out in their proper colours. * As *mistaking their humours, and misterming them the spirit; calling that the spirit of zeal, which is* indeed *a hot humour*, onely *flowing from the gall. Another windy humour* they have *proceeding from the Spleen, supposed to be the wind*, Act. 2. 3, 4. *with which being filled, they term themselves* THE GODLY BRETHREN. *I wish* (saith He) *it were not needful to make this Observation. But you shall easily know it for an Humour.* Non continetur termino

Bishop Andrews his judgment of Puritanes, in his Sermon of worshipping imaginations, p. 29. A. D. 1592. published by supreme Authority.

* Ib. p. 30.

† See from p 32. to the end.

* See his second Sermon of sending the Holy Ghost, p. 610.

mino suo; *its own limits will not hold it. They are ever mending Churches, States, Superiours, mending all save themselves*; alieno, non suo, *is the note to distinguish an humour by* — (b) *Many follow their own ghost, in stead of the Holy Ghost. For even that ghost taketh upon it to inspire. And* (c) *flesh and blood* (we know) *have their revelations.* — Having *set up* and *shrin'd* the *worldly spirit in their hearts*) *up shall all the golden Calves to uphold the present estate; down shall Christ*, ne veniant Romani, *that the Romans come not and carry us all away.* — † Again he calls them the *Automata*, the *Spectra*, the *Puppets of Religion, Hypocrites. With some spring within, the eyes are made to rowle, and their lips to wag, and their breast to give a sob; all is but* Hero's Pneumatica, *a vizor, not a very face; an outward shew of godliness*, but no inward *power of it at all.* — *And are there not somewhere in the World, some such as will receive none other spirit, or Holy Ghost, but their own ghost, and the Idol of their own conceit, the vision of their own heads, the motions of their own spirits? And if you hit not on that that is there in their hearts, they reject it, be it what it will? That make their breasts the sanctuary? That (in effect) say with the old Donatists*, Quod volumus sanctum est, *that they will have holy and nothing else? Men causelessly puffed up with their fleshly mind?* * *It is an old worn error of the* Donatists, *and but new dressed over by some fanatical spirits in our dayes, that teach in Corners; one that is not himself inwardly holy, cannot be the means of holiness to another. And where they dare too, that, one that is not in state of grace can have no right to any possession or place, for they of right belong to none, but to the true children of God; that is to none but themselves.* And These the Bishop there call's, *Fond ignorant men.* Again * *Not onely mission, but submission is a sign of one truly called to this business. But — of all prepositions, they indure not* super; *all equal, all even at least. Their spirit is not subject to the Spirit of the Prophets, nor of the Apostles neither, (if they were now alive,) but bear themselves so high, do* tam altum sapere, *as if this spirit were underling, and their spirit above the Holy Ghost.*

(b) Ezek. 13. 3.

(c) Mat. 16. 2.

† See his ninth Sermon of the same, p. 694.

2 Pet. 3. 5.

Col. 2. 18.

* ib. p. 696.

* See his tenth Serm. on the same, p. 703.

Ghost. There may be a spirit in them, there is none upon them, that indure no super, *none above them.*]

You see how *Puritanes* were described by that so eminently *judicious* and *godly Prelate*, who long before his preferments, had been † *earnestly dealt with* by a great person (being his Patron) *to hold up a side which was even then falling, and to maintain certain state points of Puritanism; but he had too much* ἀιδῆλα (as my Author alludes unto his *name*) *to be either scar'd with a Counsellors frown, or blown aside with his breath*: and therefore answered his Tempter plainly, *It was against his learning and conscience too.* His Patron seing he would be *no Fryer Pinkie*, (to be taught in a *Closet* what he should say at Saint *Paul's*) dismissed him *then* with some *disdain*; but *after* did the more *reverence his integrity*, and became no hinderer to his *ensuing greatness.*

† See a brief view of the Church of England, as it stood in the Reigns of Quen Elizabeth and King James, p. 143.

Sect. 11. Now since the Author of this Relation was Sir *John Harrington* of *Kelston*, a knowing person in those times, of which he hath left a *view* behind him, it will be pertinent to observe his *private judgement*, of those *old Puritanes* who then disquieted the Church. When the *Puritanes* (saith he) *whom some defined to be Protestants scared out of their wits, did begin by the plot of some great ones, but by the pen of Master* Cartwright, *to defend their New Discipline, their endeavour was to reduce all, in shew at least, unto the purity, but indeed unto the poverty of the Primitive Church.* That is to say, they were *sacrilegious.* For speaking *after* of the same men, *This* (saith he) *was the true Theorique and Practique of Puritanism. One, impugning the Authority of Bishops secretly, by such Lectures (as that which was lately founded by a sacrilegious Grandee, and read by* Dr. Reynolds *) The other impoverishing their livings openly, by such leases as would yield good fines to the Procurers.*

Sir John Harrington's judgment of Puritanes. Ibid. p. 7. 8.

Ib. p. 150.

He inferrs the judgement of Queen *Elizabeth* and her *Councel*, in that he saith the learned *Bancroft* obtained the *favour of Queen and State*, for his endeavours to *suppress those fantastical Novellers.* And 'tis known that his reward was the Archbishoprick of *Canterbury.* Dr. *Whitgift* also (though

The judgment of Q. Eliz. and her Privy Counsel, and of Archb. Bancroft p. 12. 13. and Archbishop Whitgift ib. p. 7. 8.

(though a great *Anti-Arminian*) was then an eminent *Confuter* of *Cartwright's Writings*. And (as a step to his *Archbishoprick*) was first rewarded with the Bishoprick of *Worcester*. Nay, Judge *Popham*, who was unwilling to have them called *Puritanes*, was yet accustomed to call them *seditious Sectaries*, which he would not have done, had he not *judged* them to be *such*. Having said how the *Queen* did approve the books of Dr. *Bancroft*, I did not add the opinion *he* had of *Puritanes*, because his *two books* have done that for me; the one discovering their *discipline*, the other, their *dangerous positions* in point of *Doctrine*, more especially *that* Doctrine which hath a tendency to the *subversion* of *Church* and *State*.

Of Judge Popham.

Ib. p. 118. 119.

I will not give you my *whole* accompt of that Author, but onely in brief put you in mind how the *Puritanes in Cambridge* had *courted Dr. Johnstill* to abet that party; and how they *reviled* him in their *pulpits*, because he would *not joyn* with them, (yet he was after made *Bishop* of *Bath* and *Wells*.) How every one made reckoning that the *Manor-house and Park of Banwel* should be made the reward of *some Courtier*, which suspicion was increas'd in that Sir *Thomas Henage* was said to have an *eare in the matter*, being an *old Courtier, and a zealous* Puritane, *whose conscience, if it were such in the Clergy, as it was found in the Dutchy, might well have digested a better booty*. * How *Queen Elizabeth* at *Oxford* had *school'd Dr.* Reynolds *for his precisenes; willing him to follow her lawes, and not to go before them. But it seems he had forgot it when he went last to* Hampton Court; *so as there he received a better schooling.*

* *Ib.* 135. *in Doctor* Herbert Westphaling *Bishop of* Hereford.

Sect. 12. Very remarkable are the *words* of the *Lord Keeper Puckering*, touching the *parity* of the *danger* to *Church* and *State* which the *Puritanes* and the *Jesuites* had brought on *both*. Remarkable, I say, as having been uttered in *Parliament*, by the special command of *Queen Elizabeth*. And here the *sitter* to be inserted, because they are not to be had, but from his own *hand-writing*: from which, by the favour of a most *noble Gentleman*, I got (about a year ago) his following *transcript*. A transcript, not of the *whole*, but of as much as concerns the *case* in hand. "And

The Lord Keeper Puckering's judgment of Puritanes by the direction of Q. Elizabeth, delivered in the House of Lords, in Parliament assembled.

"And especially you are commanded by her *Majesty* to take heed, that *no ear be given*, nor *time afforded* to "the *wearisome sollicitations* of those, that commonly be "called *Puritans*, wherewithal the late *Parliaments* have "been exceedingly *importuned*: which sort of men, "whilest in the *giddinesse of their spirits* they labour and "strive to advance † a *new eldership*. They do nothing else "but *disturb the good repose* of the *Church*, and the *Com-* "*mon-wealth*; which is as well *grounded* for the body of "Religion it self, and as well *guided* for the discipline, as "any Realm that professeth the truth. And the same thing "is already made good to the world, by many the writings "of *learned* and * *godly* men; neither answer'd, nor an-"swerable by any of these *new-fangled Refiners*. And as the "present Case standeth, it may be doubted, whether *they*, "or the *Jesuites*, do offer more *danger*, or be more speedi-"ly to be *repressed*. For albeit the *Jesuites* do empoison "the hearts of her Majesties subjects under a pretext of "*conscience*, to withdraw them from their obedience due "to her Majesty, yet do they the same but *closely* and only "in *privy corners*; but *these men* do both *publish* in their "*printed books*, and *teach* in all their *Conventicles*, sundry "opinions, not onely *dangerous* to the well-setled *Estate* "and *Policy* of the *Realm*, by putting a Pike between the "*Clergy* and the *Laity*, but also much *derogatory* to her "sacred *Majesty*, and her *Crown*, as well by the *diminution* "of her ancient and lawful *Revenues*, and by denying her "Highness *Prerogative* and *Supremacy*, as by offering *peril* "to her *Majesties safety* in her own kingdom. In all which "things, (however in many other points they *pretend* to be "at *war* with *the Popish Jesuites*, yet) by the *seperation* of "themselves from the *unity* of their *fellow-subjects*, and by "*abasing* the *sacred authority* and Majesty of their *Prince*, "they do both *joyn and concur with the Jesuites* in opening "the *door*, and preparing the *way* to the *Spanish Invasion* "that is *threatned* against the Realm. And thus having ac-"cording to the weakness of my best understanding) delive-"red her Majesties *most Royal pleasure*, and * *wise direction*, "I rest here, with most humble suit for her Majesties gra-"cious

† *Mark who they were that were then called* Puritanes.

* *Mark who they were that were so esteemed.*

* *Mark what was wisdom in* Q. Elizabeth's *days.*

"cious pardon in supply of my defects, and recommend "you to the Author of all good counsel.]

Here you see the *Presbyterians* were then the *Puritanes*, the *new-fangled refiners of giddy spirits*. The *Episcopal* persons were then the *godly*, as well as the *learned* of the land. O what times do we live in, when a *new-named godliness* is grown in *fashion*.

The judgment of Dr. R. Clerk, out of the Translators of the Bible, concerning the then-Puritanes, in his second visitat. Serm. on Zech. 11. 17. Va Pastori Idolo, p. 251.

Sect. 13. In the time of Doctor *Richard Clerk*, (not a Courtier, nor an *Arminian*,) to whom with Doctor *Saravia* the *translation of the Bible* was committed, as far as from the *Pentateuch* to the *Paralipomena*, you may see what judgment was made of *Puritanes* by several passages of his *Sermons*. Amongst very many *others*, take that which follows.

"The two Universities, the very eyes of the Realm, "being so well able to furnish God's *Flock* with *seeing* "*Shepherds*, our Church is little beholding to her Patrons "for preferring to the Regiment of her Flock so many "*unletter'd and unsufficient Priests*, either *Idols*, *or Idols fol-* "*lows*. Whose eyes have either a film grown over them, that "they see nothing; or a Pin and Web in them, that they "see but little. And these are the men, whose *tongues* are "*fierie* indeed, but not *cloven*; that is, zealous, but not "learned; preach against learning, *pull down the Prelacy*, "*to rear up a Presbyterie*; *Bray forth intemperate censures* "*against the lawful ceremonies of the Church, as being su-* "*perstitious, the dregs and reliques of Popery*; *kneeling at* "*the Sacrament, the repetition of certain prayers in our Li-* "*turgie, the singing of Service, the sound of the Organ in* "*Collegiate Churches, the square Cap and Surplisse, the* "*painted windows, marrying with the Ring, and christen-* "*ing with the Cross, and such like*: In some of which, *were* "*our Prelates as courageous, as our Puritanes are presum-* "*ptuous, they would be either enforced to order, or tur-* "*ned out of Orders.*] You see the opinion of that both learned and pious man; who tells us *who* were the *Puritanes*, and *what* they were; and that the *Prelates* were never *too cruel* to them, unlesse it were in being too

kind.

kind. Observe what he saith in another Sermon.

"Our *factious Pharisees* joyn with the *Herodians*, and "that *against Christ*. *Judas*-like they *betray him* into the "hands of sinners. The *pragmatical Presbyterian*, preach-"eth against *Prelacy* unto *Lay-ears*. A pleasing Argument "unto some Seculars, either *Schismatical*, or *Sacrilegious* "both men of *zeal*, passive in the *one*, *The zeal of Gods* "*house eat them up*: active in the *other*, They have a *zeal* "*to eat up God's house*: cry with *Zeba* and *Zalmunna*, *Let* "*us take to our selves the houses of God in possession.* 'Twas "once *Simeon* and *Levi brethren in evil.* 'Tis now *Reu-*"*ben* and *Levi*; *Levi* must be one. — Our *Corah's* and "*Dathan's* have not risen yet. Not come forth in *publick*. "The *wisdom* of our *Senators* hath prevented that they "should *not swarm*. But they have *lain out* often. They "have gathered together, sometimes sixty at once in *Ca-*"*nons*. Their *Classes*, *Synods*, *Conferences*, have been at "least in *Moses* his moderate term, *gatherings together*. "Their *Petitions*, *Supplications*, *Admonitions*, *Demon-*"*strations*, what were they but *gatherings together*? Works "but of some *one head* happly, but of *many hands*. Their "very *motions are commotions*, penn'd by some *one*, main-"tain'd by *multitudes*. — Some of the *Titles* which they "*envy the Bishops*, they can be content to *assume* unto "*themselves*. *Right Reverend Fathers*; yea *Cartwright* "*most* * *Reverend*. The best is, *Calvin* and *Beza* differ here. *Beza's* wrong to Bishops *Calvin* rights, and calls even *Archbishops* a *moderate honour*.

In his 1. Visit. Serm. on Num. 16. 3. p. 242. 243.

Ib. p. 245.

* This the *Title* of an *Archbishop*.

Sect. 14. If you would see a great deal in a little time, concerning the *nature* of a *Puritan*, *before* he had gotten himself the *name*, (as well as *after*,) you may be pleased to consult the late *Examen Historicum*, set out by that *exact and learned Writer*, whom you name without his *due title*, as if you thought him an *under-graduate*, although you could not but know him an *eminent Doctor in Divinity*. He will shew you a part of *Wickliff's Gospel*, and what a *Protestant Religion* he would have brought into the World, fitly said (by that *Reverend Author*) to contain

An accompt of Puritanes from the Examen Historicum.

* p. 91. 92. &c. *Wickliff's new Gospel.*

tain the lineaments of the *Puritane-platform*. He will shew you where you may read † that the *Dominicans*, with a *Puritane*, can pass for *Orthodox in judgment*. * And they who *approve* of *good works*, for *Prelatically affected*. (a) There you may see a *Den* of *Schismaticks* Canonizd and *Sainted* by a *Time-serving Historian*; whilest Things prescribed by *God's Church* are Toyes and *Trinckets*. (b) You may read of a *Puritan's* immortal *malice*, pursuing the *Protestant's Champion* into his Bed of Rest, as if the *Jesuites* had *hir'd* him to *kill* their *enemy* when he was *dead*. (c) You may see a *Puritane* defending those *sourrilous Libels* which *Job Throgmorton*, *Penry*, *Feuner*, and the rest of the *Puritane Rabble*, (it is the Authors own word) did publish in print *against the Bishops*, having first exclaimed against the *Queen* and her *Councel*, (for being *Protestants in their wits*, that is, as they phrased it) *for opposing the Gospel*. Such service for the *Papists* was then done by the *Puritanes*, whose Libels were *cited* and *applauded* by those of *Rome*: even *Hacket himself* hath an *Apology* made for him, although as *execrable a miscreant*, as most have been of that paste. (d) The libellous Pamphlets of *Martin-Mar-Prelate* (that *early Puritane* in Queen *Elizabeth's* dayes) were urged by the *Papists* as *Authentick Witnesses*, and sufficient *Evidences* for the *disgrace* and condemnation of the *Protestant-Church*. So *true* was that which I shew'd you from the Lord Keeper *Puckering*, that the *Puritanes* do *joyn* and *concur* with the *Jesuites*.

† p. 106.
* p. 109.
(a) p. 128. 129.
(b) p. 130.
(c) p. 156. 157. Their helping on the Popish Interest.
(d) p. 156.

What (e) Principles of *Rebellion* were scattered abroad among the people by the *Puritane* leaders in several Countreys, such as *Wicksiff*, *Clesselius*, *Knox*, and *Wiseman*, that excellent *Examen* will quickly tell you. (f) And what Heathenish *Notes* the *Genevians* put upon the *Bible*. (g) How *Felton* a *zealous Puritane* committed his *murder* upon the *Duke*. How *Covetousness* and *Non-conformity* were so *married together*, that 'twas not easie to *divorce* them. (h) How an *Act of Parliament* was made against *Puritanes*, 23 *Eliz. c. 3.* (i) And a *High-Commission* enforced

Their rebellious Principles.
(e) p. 138 139. 203.
(f) p. 178. 179.
(g) p. 151.
(h) p. 153.
(i) p. 156.

forced to *curb* them. (k) How *mock-ordinations* were made at *Antwerp*, by a mongrel sort of *Presbyterians*, consisting of *two blew Aprons to each Cruel Nightcap*. In a word, it will tell you their *sabbatizing*, their *downfall*, their essayes to rise, their disappointments, their new attempts by the way of *Lecturing*, (in which the *Jesuites* went *before* them,) their pride without parallel, their malice without measure, and their acts of injustice without remorse.

(k) p. 158.

Sect. 15. That irresistible *Champion* of the *Protestant Church* against her Adversaries of *Rome*, (I mean) the learned *Bishop Montague*, who was imployed by *King James* to write the *Annals of the Church Catholick*, and (all along as he went) to reform *Baronius* on the *one* side, as the *Magdeburgenses* on the *other*, doth often justifie and distinguish the *Church of England*, no less from the *Puritane*, then *Popish* party. He calls them in one place, * *the sacrilegious hypocrites of our Country, who rob God and the Church, under colour of spirituality*; saying that *God is well pleased with no other worship then what is spiritual*. In another place he speaks of them as our Saviour spake of the *Pharisees*, *Ecclesia Anglicana recte, quicquid vacillent Puritani*, ἔξω κεκοσμημένοι, ἔσθεν ἀκάθαρτοι, He had long before noted, [That *many were arrant* Puritanes *in heart, who for preferment did conform, holding with the Hare, and running with the Hound. And that many once* Puritanes, *turn'd often* Papists. *Fleeting being commonly from one extreme to another. Men of moving, violent, quick-silver, gun-powder spirits, can never rely upon middling courses, but* dum furor in cursu est, *run on headlong into Extremes. And so I may avow I will not be a* Papist *in haste, because I never was a* Puritane *in earnest or in jeast; having found it true in my small Observation, that our Revolters unto* Popery, *were* Puritanes *avowed or addicted first.*] —— A little after, he calls *the Jesuites*, *the Puritane-Papists*; and for the *Protestant-Puritanes* he doth not reckon them as Members of the Church of *England*, but onely [*an overreaching-fashion*, *which*

Bishop Montague's *judgment* of Puritanes.

* Religiosi nebulones nostrates Deum & Ecclesiam emulgentes, aiunt, Deum cultu merè spirituali invaeris. *Montac. in* Βαρβῆρων. *ad An. Chr.* 2. See his *Appello Cæsarem*, *part.* 2. *c.* 1. *p.* 110. 111, 112.

Ib. p. 113.

which was wont to be shrowded under the Covert of the Church of England; *and to publish their many idle dreams, fancies, and furies unto the World, under pretext of the doctrine of our Church. And our Opposites of the* Romish *side did accordingly charge our Church with them.*] which words when I *compare* with divers things before mentioned, I am apt to think that many *Papists* did call themselves of the *Church of* England, and *acted their parts* on our *English Theater*; under the *name* and *disguise* of the *Puritane-party*, that so they might help the *real Puritanes* to bring our *Protestant Church* into disgrace and misery.

Sect. 16. To this I will adde some words of *Grotius*, because he was so great an *honour* to the *true Protestant Religion*, not more for his *learning* then *moderation*: who speaking of the *King* of *Britain* and of some *obligations* received from him, thought fit to say [*The most serene, and if the* Puritanes *will suffer him, the most potent King of* England.] words most worthy your consideration, as having been written in the year 1645. when you cannot but remember how much his *Majesty* was promised, *to be made the mightiest King in Christendom.* It is but seldom that *Grotius* doth *name* the word *Puritane* (although sometimes * he names it too.) but he gives us so *often* a just accompt of their *Tenets*, which have commonly broken forth into *Blood* and *Rapine*, that I need not stay longer upon *his* exact judgment.

Grotius his judgment concerning Puritanes. Serenissimi, & si per *Puritanos* licent, Potentissimi Regis *Britanniarum* beneficio, &c. *Discuss. Riv. Apol. p.* 57.

* Rex *Jacobus* se *Puritanis* semper exosum fuisse dicit, non alio Nomine quàm quod Rex esset. *Ibid. pag.* 92.

Mr. Thorndike's judgment of Puritanes. *In his Epilogue to the Trag. of the Church of* England, *Conclus. p.* 405. *Ib. p.* 413.

I will conclude my whole Catalogue with what I lately met with in my perusal of Master *Thorndike*. [*It is evident* (saith he) *that Preachers and People are overspread with a damnable Heresie of* Antinomians *and* Enthusiasts, *formerly when* Puritanes *were not divided from the Church of* England, *called* Etonists, *and* Grindeltons, *according to several Countreys, &c.—well had it been had that most pious and necessary desire to restore publick penance, been seconded by the zeal and compliance of all estates, and not Rifled by the tares of* Puritanisme, *growing up with the Reformation*

of

of it.—In fine, if any thing may have been defective, or amisse, in that order which the Church of England *establisheth, it is but justice to compare it with both extremes which it avoideth.* (meaning *Popery* on one hand, and *Puritanisme* on another.) If you read his *whole* Book, you will probably *return* to the Church of *England*, by being *convinced* that you have *left* her. If you will read but some *part*, you will find him *shewing* what I shall now but *say* from him: *viz.* ' That the *Scotish Presbyterians* have done like *them*, who *oblige subjects* to *depose their Soveraign*, *if the* Pope *excommunicate them*; making both *subjects* and *Soveraign* the Popes *vassals*; them to *rule*, and those to *obey*, at his discretion who can *excommunicate* them. ' That it is *Puritanism*, or *Popery* for *subjects* to fight against their *Soveraign*; yea a Branch of *Puritanism*, which came from *Popery*. ' That there is one Principle of some *Puritanes*, from whence the *true conclusion being drawn* maketh *meer* Popery *of the whole duty of a Christian*. And *that the Church of* Rome *holdeth no error in the Faith, any thing neer so pernicious*. What he saith of *Presbyteries*, as to the *sacrilege of Schism in the constitution*, and the *nullity of Gods' promises in the effect*, you may read at large in his *conclusion*, p.417.418, *&c.*

Id. lib. 1. p. 77.

Ib. p. 78.

Conclus. p. 418.

Sir, You have *now* the conclusion of the whole matter, as far as concerns the whole importance of those *two words Non-conformity*, and *Puritanism*. And that however you were pleased to make a *difference* betwixt the *old* and *new Episcopal Divines*, yet in their judgment of *Puritanes*, there's none at all; unless in this, that the *old* ones were more *severe*. Our excellent Bishop *Hall* (now with God) was one of those *late Prelates* of whom you speak; and what his thoughts were of *Puritanes* you may judge by his *Exhortation* in the *Synod of* Dort. For as in the dayes of Queen *Elizabeth* (and thence downwards) they were wont to compare the *Puritanes* to the *Papists*, so did that * excellent Prelate compare the *Papists* to the *Puritanes*: and that for no reason more then their pretending to be *purer* then *others* are, or then indeed they are *themselves*

Bishop Hall's *judgment of* Puritanes *in his Latin exhortation to the Synod at* Dort, *on* Eccles. 7. 16.

* *Vide Acta Synodi* Dordrectanæ, *p.* 57. *Sess.* 16.

selves. And this doth lead me to that which follows. For

You say, *Among the vulgar, a* Puritane (*all over* England *where ever you came*) *was one that would speak seriously or reverently of God or heaven, or of the Scripture, and that would talk of hell, and the life to come, &c. that would not swear, or would reprove a swearer, or a drunkard, or a prophaner of holy things, &c.* Sect. 23.]

King James distinguish'd the Knave's Puritane, from the Puritane-Knave.

Sect. 27. If any man living did ever call such men as these *Puritanes,* (as you do nakedly affirm, but do not prove) he must answer to God, for his having done so like a *Puritane himself.* It being as unjust to call such *Puritanes,* as it is now for Mr. *Baxter* to call the *Prelatists, Papists,* nay *Formalists,* nay what *he pleaseth,* p. 111, 112, 113, 114, 115. But really, Sir, I cannot imagine, with what colour of justice you should first make this the *vulgar notion* so contrary to that which you confessed to be the *King's,* the *old Episcopal Divines,* and the *late Prelates* (for you know the *King's way* is the *vulgar way,*) and that then you should imply it to have been *mine,* and so against *me* confute your own *fancy,* and *nothing else.* I have ever distinguished (as well as K. *James*) between the *Knave's Puritane,* and the *Puritan-Knave.* But we must not be afraid to call *Puritans, hypocrites,* because there are that are *not hypocrites,* who yet are called *Puritans.* Must not one have his *right* name, because another hath a *wrong?* Let every man have his *own,* though some have that which is *anothers.* For *my use* of the word *Puritane,* I am encompassed about with a *cloud of witnesses,* that I have used it as I *ought.* And my witnesses are *such,* as for *greatnesse, wisdome, pitty, learning,* or whatever else is most *lovely,* I suppose you will grant *beyond exception.*

You say, *my party gave the* Puritanes *a new name, and the* Puritane *was called a* Round-head, (*a learned invention, intimating that the* Puritanes *do speak, and not as* Long-heads, *bark, or grunt,*) *and when the worse had given liberty to the rage of such as hated* Puritanes, *then ordinarily he was a* Puritane, *or a* Roundhead, *that was heard to pray, or sing a Psalm in his house,* Sect. 23.]

Sect. 28. Though I have nothing to do with the name

of

of *Roundhead*, not ever *called* any *so*, (that I can remember) by *word of mouth*, much *less* in any of my *writings*, (so as I wonder what you meant in telling me of it without cause,) yet perhaps that title is *not* so *new* as you imagin. For *Petrus Crinitus* could have told you of some *soldiers* in *Germany*, above a *hundred years* ago, *Qui Agmen Tonsile, à rotunde detonsis Capitibus, dicebantur*. And 'tis better to have the' *long-head* of *Thersites*, then the *long-ears* of such an *Issachar* as *Midas* was. As it is very much better to *bark* in *one* sense, then to *bray* in *another*; which things concern not *your self*, or *me*. And therefore to speak without impertinence, I would very fain know where that *godly* man *lives* who was ever called *Roundhead* for being *godly*, or meerly for *praying in his house*: which I suppose is done even by men of *all parties*, excepting them who are transported above *all ordinances*, by the *presumption* which they have of their *absolute election*, and their *impossibility* to *fall* from *Grace*. But if *he* who was HEARD to *pray in his house*, did pray so LOWD, and so *neer the street*, that passengers could *not chuse but hear him*, it was not his *praying*, but his *hypocrisie*, which was likely to be reviled. A great deal of *naughtiness* may be committed, though not in *prayer*, *as prayer*; yet in a contrived Pharisaical both *length* and *loudness*. When our Saviour did call the *Scribes and Pharisees hypocrites*, yea *Serpents*, and *generation of vipers*, (notwithstanding they were esteemed the *godly party*) it was not meerly because they *prayed*, nor only because their Prayers were *long*, but because *they made their long prayers for a pretence*; that so the *Orphans and Widows houses might be swallow'd* down the *more glibly*. *When thou prayest* (saith our Saviour) *thou shalt not be as the Hypocrites are; for they love to pray standing in the Synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men*. And he that prayes in his house to be *heard of men*, is neer kin to him who prays on purpose *to be seen*: therefore it follows in the text, *When thou prayest, enter into thy closet & shut thy door. — And thy Father who seeth in secret shall reward thee openly*.

Of the word Roundhead, and praying aloud in private.

Petrus Crinitus *de bello Rusticano.*

* οὐξὺ ἥλω κεφαλῶ, &c. *Hom.*

† *Isa.* 56. 10.

Matth. 23. 33.

vers. 14.

Mat. 6. 5.

vers. 6.

You say, *Sometimes the sign of purgation, by which men must prove themselves no* Puritans, *nay, if they could swear nine Oaths in a breath*. Sect. 23.]

Sect. 19.

How the Puritanes are the worst kind of swearers.

Sect. 19. I will not say what hath been said, That *this is certainly a Hummer*. But I hope it is an *untrue report*, which if it is, it is *prodigiously such*. I never heard any thing like it, and you ought to have given some kind of *proof* that you might not be concluded the *Raiser* of it. If the Tale hath truth in it, why did you not *name* the Malefactors, that (for the *good* of *themselves*, and *others*.) they might be brought to some *exemplary punishment*? such *scandalous* sinners before these times, would have been *paradigmatiz'd* in the Bishops Courts. Nor could any thing less then *extirpation of Episcopacy*, have gained an *impunity* for such a *crime*. And now to tell you the very truth, if I may judge of *Antipuritanes*, by those whom I am acquainted with, they are as *free* from this *vice*, as most of the *Puritanes* are *guilty* of it. I speak not of *swearing nine Oathes in one breath*, but of *swearing and forswearing*, as many times in *two breaths* (whereof the one is *hot*, and the other *cold*) as they conceive to be for their *carnal interest*. Are there not *Puritanes* who have *sworn*, first an Oath of *Allegiance*, 2. An Oath of *Supremacy*, 3. An Oath of *Canonical obedience*, 4. An Oath intitled the *Negative Oath*, 5. An Oath which was called *the solemn League and Covenant*, 6. An Oath which was taken by the name of an *Engagement*, besides their *University and Collegiate Oaths*? And I have heard they *swore an Oath to live and die with my Lord of* Essex. Put all together, and you will find them to be *Nine*, with some advantage: and the *Sacrament* taken at *ordination* of *Ministers under the Bishops*, is the *solemnest Oath* that can be taken. Much more I could say, but that a *word to the wise* may seem *sufficient*.

You say, *The way that one Company of the Kings souldiers testified their freedom from this crime, by (as credible impartial witnesses in* Somersetshire *told you, that saw them do it) was by pricking their fingers, and letting their blood run into the Cup, and drinking a health to the Divel in their own blood*, Sect. 23.]

Sect. 20. If this were *true*, it were not any thing to the *purpose* as being neither for *you*, nor against *my self*. I having

ving spoken of *Puritanes* in the words of *King James*, not in words of *my framing*; and as I found them in an Historian of unquestionable *prudence* and *moderation*. Again, I spake *ex professo* of *Presbyterians*, and of *Puritanes* onely by *accident*. Nor did I speak of them otherwise, then *Queen Elizabeth*, *King James*, *Archbishop Bancroft*, *Archbishop Whitgift*, *Bishop Andrews*, *Bishop Hall*, *Doctor Sanderson* and others had afforded me a warrant from all their stiles. Yet see with what *Stories* you entertain me, without the least *offer* of any *proof*. Nay see if it is not so contrived as if it were purposely intended to pass for *incredible* with all that read it. For let me put you to a few *questions*, 1. Was there ever any *Company* of his *Majesties souldiers* who were in very good earnest *suspected to be Puritans*, so as to need a *testimonial* that they were *none*? 2. Were they so *far suspected* of being *Puritanes*, that nothing less then their *own blood*, and a *Health to the Divel*, could satisfie the *suspecters*, and gain their *freedom* from such *suspicion*? when the Tale in it self is so *incredible*, what professor of Christianity would not *suspect* the very *witnesses*, (however professing to be no less then *eye-witnesses*) who should suggest so *strange* and so *incredible* a thing? or who would *cite* such testimonies *in materiâ tam gravi*, without the naming of *persons*, *time*, and *place*, and without the specifying of *all other circumstances*, to free himself from being reckoned a *False-Accuser*? which of the two is the greater sin, *to drink a health to the Divel*, or to *gratifie the Divel* by *falsely affirming* that some have done it to *free* themselves from being *Puritanes*, I leave it to be judged by the indifferent Reader.

The Tale of drinking a bloody health to the Divel no less impertinent then uncharitable.

But now, suppose it to be *true*, that *some did swear five Oaths in a breath*, and *others drink their own blood as a health to the Divel*, must you infer that they did it as a *sign of purgation*, (as you *word* it in your *first* story) or to *testifie their freedom from the crime of* Puritanism, (as you expresse it in your *second*?) it were very easie to *pay* you home in your *own coyn*, and to *load* you with more of it then you are *able* to *bear*. But I will onely speak of some

A great and dangerous falsification in the management of the Tale.

notorious matters of *Fact*, to let you see the *advantage* you now afford me. There was an eminent * *Presbyterian* in this County of *Northampton*, an able Preacher by *repute*, and a *godly man*, who for *Incest* and *Murder* was *hang'd* in the sight of *divers thousands*, there are thousands now living, who saw it done; his *trial* and *execution* were so *publick*, that I need not tell you from whom I heard it. But how would you take it if I should say that such a *Puritane* did purposely *defile his Niece*, and consent to the *murder* of the *child* he had by her, and end his dayes upon the *Gallows* to *prove himself free from the Prelatical party*? if you find in your self, that you would take it in ill part, then learn not to *speak* what you would not *hear*. I could also tell a story of a *Reverend* man of the *Presbyterie*, (of whom it will hardly be believ'd) that taking upon him to be a *Fighter*, as well as a *Preacher* in the Army, he killed a souldier of his own Company in the Town of *Warwick*.

* Mr. Barker of Pitchley.

But of all the men in the World, *you* and *I* should be *careful* not to speak *without ground*, of *other* men's failings, since *others* have spoken so very *groundlessly* of *you* and *me*. * Mr. *Robertson* (you say) *did talk confidently of his discourses with Mr.* Hotchkiss, though *Mr.* Hotchkiss *professed he never saw him*. And so you say that Mr. *Blake hath printed things of your self, so false and groundless, that he might as well have said, you take your self to be King of Spain*. Of Mr. *Tombes* his *Aspersions*, you very frequently complain. And you know by whom you have been accused as a *Papist*, and a *Socinian*. In all which I am obliged to take part with you by my resentment, and to profess my *disbelief* of many things I hear of you; I having suffered my self, in the very same *measure* that you have done. I will not mention mens *names* in a more publick manner then they do *mine*; because I am tenderer of *them*, then they have been of *themselves*, or *me*. But this I cannot forbear to say, (upon so pregnant an opportunity) that *malicious slanders* are raised against me, and unworthily *whisper'd* from one enemy to another, though most evident

Men should be taught by their suffering, not to do wrong.

* Disp. 5. of Sacram. p. 489.

Ibid. p. 500.

vident *Contradictions* to the plainest *matters* of *Fact*. The Tempter many times *betrayes* his *Instruments*, whilst he *Imployes* them. As if in very good earnest he had *owed them a spight*, as we use to say by a kind of *Proverb*. He puts them upon speaking such *ill-made* stories, as are not onely *false*, but *Impossible to be true*. 'Tis said I *did* this, and that, which was impossible to be *done*. Just as if it should be said, that *I created my Parents*, or *squar'd the Circle*. Indeed I have read of *Apollonius Tyaneus*, that he could tell at *Ephesus*, what in that very houre was done at *Rome*; the Devill was such a *Familiar* to him. But that I should speak a thing in *England*, whilst my Body and my Soule were both in *France*, is the wildest invention I ever heard of. It is my comfort that I suffer *the most Incredible* of Slanders, which are as *Innocent* in one sense, as they are *criminal* in another: And that I suffer for *well doing*, even to *those* very *persons*, from *whom* I suffer. But that a Sermon of *Love* should procure me more *Hatred*, than All the Actions of my whole Life, would seem as wonderfull a Thing, as that *Elijah* with *water* should set the *green wood on fire*, but that I consider what *Age* we *live* in; And that the *Fire* is more *common* which comes from *Hell*, then that which *Elijah pray'd down from Heaven*. Besides, I know it is part of the *Christians Lot*, which I take in *good part*, and doe *thank God* for it.

But it were well if most men would make a *Covenant* with their *Eares*, not to listen to *meer Rumors* which doe not bring their *warrant* with them. And another *Covenant* with their *Lips*, not to *utter* such Rumors without all reason. For through a defect of these two, what *Calumnies* have been raised upon men of *all sorts*, which (with one sort or other) have found great *welcome*, and *entertainment*? I will give you an Instance in some particulars, which are many wayes pertinent to my present Enterprise. It was dogmatically affirmed by the *whole Assembly of Divines*, in a Letter which they sent to *all the Protestant* Churches *beyond the Seas*, *That the King and his party had an intent to set up Popery, and even to extir-*

A Caveat against Raisers of false Reports.

See Biblioth. Regia part. 1. Sect. 1. p. 58. 59. to p. 65.

pate the true Reformed Religion. "*And that they had not onely attempted, but in great measure prevailed for the putting thereof in execution.* A thing so far from being *true*, that the King *protested* his *intentions* were directly *contrary*, and from the *Primate of Armagh* received the *Sacrament upon it*, solemnly *wishing* that *that Sacrament might be his damnation, if his heart did not joyn with his lips in that protestation.* He also *declared* the same thing to all the *Transmarine Protestant Churches.* Nay it was *part* of his *last words*, the *sincerity* of which he also *sealed* with his *blood.* And now you publickly confess, (as Mr. *Prin* had done before you in his Signal *Memento*, p. 12.) *You do not believe he was a Papist, but a moderate Protestant, and that his Conference with the Marquess of* Worcester *may satisfie men for that.* p. 106. By the same excess of injustice, Archbishop *Bancroft*, Archbishop *Laud*, Archbishop *Usher*, Bishop *Bramhal*, and Doctor *Cousins* have been exhibited to the people as downright *Papists*, though as great adversaries to *Rome*, as *Rome* hath had since the Reformation. How many others in particular, and the Prelatists in general have been traduced, you know very well, and Doctor *Sanderson* hath told you with what *injustice.* It was not onely the saying of Doctor *Bernard*, concerning the late *Archbishop of Armagh*, that *some of the simpler sort hearing of a conjunction of Popery and Prelacy, have thought they could not be parted in him*; but it was also the complaint of the *Primate himself*, that exceptions were taken against his Letter, as if *he had thereby confirmed Papism*, and *Arminianism.* Which yet I believe was as far from truth, as what was said by *your Adversaries* of *you*; or by you of *Grotius*, Bishop *Wren*, Bishop *Pierce*, and Doctor *Taylor*; or by *Bolsec* of Mr. *Calvin*, that he was *eaten up of Lice*; or by the *Papists* of the *Waldenses*, that they were *Sorcerers*, and *Witches*; or by some of Saint *Austin*, that he was a *Manichean*; or by the *Puritanes* of Bishop *Andrews*, that he was *guilty of superstition*; or by the *same* of Bishop *Montague* that he was *turned unto the Papists*; or by *Standish* of *Erasmus*, that he *denied* the *Resurrection*,

Of the judgm. of the late Archbishop of Arm. p. 61.

Ibid. p. 19.

Bolsec. in vitâ Calvini. Pref. to Disp. against Master Tombes. Exam Hist. p. 104.

on, and *blasphemed Christ's miracles, as done by Magick*; or by *Bellarmine* of the *same*, that he was a friend to *Arianism*; or by Mr. *Hickman* of *myself*, that the printed Doctrines of *Zuinglius*, &c. (who were dead and buried before I was born) were the *meer Chimara's of my brain*. I pray consider these things, and set a *guard* upon your *pen* from this time forwards.

You say, *I must be supposed to mean by a Puritane, a man that feareth God, &c.* Sect.23.]

Sect.21. I more admire at this speech, then at all the rest that have fallen from you; for your own *conscience* is my witness, and so are all my Readers *eyes*, that my notion of a *Puritane* hath been ever agreeable with those which I have lately set before you from Bishop *Andrews*, and Bishop *Hall*, Doctor *Clark*, and Doctor *Sanderson*, with divers others beyond *exception*. How can you hope to be believed in what you say of *nine Oaths in a breath*, and *drinking healths unto the Divel*, when you can *wilfully corrupt* the plainest words that can be spoken? And say, I MUST be supposed to mean a man that feareth God: whereas there is not so much as any *circumstance* of any the least probability that I should *mean* as you *say*; but the *contrary* is as visible as the *Sun at noon*, that I mean such *Puritanes* as have a *right* to that Title. Neither fearing God, nor hating covetousness; neither seeking God's Kingdom, nor the righteousness thereof; but making a *stalking-horse* of *Religion*, whereby to come at their *carnal ends*.

A confident corrupting of plain words.

You say, *I deviate lamentably from Catholicism, in my uncharitable censures of the Puritans and Presbyterians. That its no Catholick Church which cannot hold such men as these, nor a Catholick Disposition, that cannot embrace them with that unfeigned special love that's due to Christians*, Sect. 24.]

Sect.22. Still you lamentably beat upon the very same hoof, *standing still* a great deal faster then some can *gallop*. With unsignificant *Repetitions*, *naked affirmations*, and want of any thing like a *proof*, you are able to advance another Section concerning *Puritanes* and *Presbyterians*; nor

How some Puritanes have excommunicated themselves.

not referring to any *word*, which I had spoken of either; not to any *one page*, where my Censure may appear to have been uncharitable. My opinion is, you durst not cite my *words* or *pages*; for then your foule dealing had been too visible to the Reader. Nay then you must have written *another book* to *some* purpose; not *This*, which you know is to *none at all*. Had you *answered* my *Book*, or any little *part* of it, I must have given you a *Reply*. But since you still *begin* with me, I can but *answer*. And that I can doe very sufficiently, by barely *denying* what you affirm *without proof*. But if you will fairly consult my book, you will find I have said no other things of the *Puritanes*, then I cite them saying of *themselves*. And are you angry with me, for *believing* the men upon their *words*? Or are you so kind to their *Rebellions*, their *Sacrileges*, and *Murders*, (all *recorded* by some of *themselves*, from whom *you know* I have my *proofs*) as that you have not the *patience* to hear them *censur'd*? I know not how you will give me a more *colourable* accompt, unlesse you confesse in the *end* (what should have been done at the *beginning*) That you *knew not* what I had written, or thought it best to take *no notice* of it. Now how can *Catholicism* bind any man, not to censure such *Puritanes*, as were so *rigidly* either *Scotish*, or *Scotized Presbyterians*? Or how can the *Catholick Church hold*, what will not *indure* to be *held*? The Church of God is like a *Net*, in which are *fish* of *all sorts*, excepting the *violent* and the *slippery*, which *break out* into the *Ocean*. They who *cast out* their *Bishops*, and * *separate* themselves from the Regular way of God's *worship*, are *ἀυτοκαταδικοι* in St. *Paul's* own notion; And † *Rejected* by *others*, for being * *condemned of themselves*.

* Jude 19.

† Tit.3.10.

* Ver.11.

The Monopolizer of Censoriousnesse no good Projecter.

Again I may ask you, why I may not be *Catholick*, and censure *Puritanes*, as well as you may censure *Prelatists*, and yet be *Catholick*: Must *none* be censorious, except *your selfe*? Or is it lawfull for *Mr. Baxter*, to revile his Fathers and Brethren for being *constant* in their *obedience* to the most *persecuted Precepts* of Jesus Christ? And is it not law-

lawfull for *Mr. Pierce*, to convince the *sons* of *Disobedience* of their impieties, when he doth it by no lesse then their own *Hand-writings*? you Sir (sooner or later) have pass'd your censure upon *all sorts* of men; (even them that draw nearest to your Religion) and will you not allow me to censure *One*? Compare your selfe with your selfe, and turne your eyes *inward*, and rather repent what you have written, then continue to write what you must repent of. Whereas you question my *love* to *Puritanes*, I wish your love to the *Prelatists* were no whit *lesse*. Did I not love their *Soules*, whose *Hypocriticall Sanctity* I ought to loath, I would not pray (as I doe) for their *Conversion*; nor would I labour (as I have done) to make them ashamed of their *Simulations*. Did I not *love them in my heart*, I would rather *suffer their sinnes upon them*, then suffer their *hatred* by my *Reproofes*. I will never consent, that men (whose Soules are dearer to me than all the things in this world) shall be *carnally secure* in a *course of sinne*, upon a dreadfull supposition that they are *Saints*, and cannot *possibly fall* into God's Displeasure, so farre forth as to incurre a *reall danger of Damnation*. I say I will not *consent* to such a mischief; no not so much as by being *silent*: for He that saith, *Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart*, doth also say, *Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy brother, and shalt not suffer sinne upon him*. And yet I know as well who saith, *Give not that which is holy unto the doggs, neither cast your pearles before swine*. And therefore if the *Puritanes* shall make me *know* that they are *such* (either by *barking*, or *biting*, or *trampling* my Admonitions *under their feet*) I shall resolve at last to allow them no more of my *Correption*; Resting satisfied in this, that *I have freed mine owne soul*.

Levit. 19. 17.

Matth. 7. 6.

Ezek. 33. 9.

Sect. 23. Having eas'd your self a little of your *reproaches against me*, you immediately proceed to *commend*

your

A strange kind of Catholick, who is against the whole Church; yet partially cleavers to a Sect, though he condemns it.

your self. For you say [*You can say*, and that *with boldness, that you have attained to so much impartiality in your Religion, that you would gladly cleave to any party, how much disgraced soever, that you could perceive were in the right,— loving all Christians of what sort soever, that may be truly called Christians*, Sect.24.] Yet am I not able to discern by all I have read of your writings, to what party in Christendom you either *do*, or *can* cleave; unless by your *cleaving* you mean your being *partial*, which is a flat *contradiction* to your pretended *impartiality*. A *Presbyterian* properly you cannot be, though by an usual *Catachresis* I do afford you that *name*, for your being so very * *partial* to that sort of men. How you declare against their *Discipline*, I have put you in *remembrance* by the *twelfth Section of my first Chapter*. How *inconsistent* you are with them in point of *Doctrine*, your *Disputings* and *Apologies*, and *other* writings do evince. What Christians in the World do you not *justifie* or *condemn*, as present interest or passion do chance to sway? that out of *many* sorts of Christians you would faign have *one* of your *picking*, is very evident. But if I am ask'd what side you are *wholly for*, I must profess to believe you are of *none*. And I can give such reasons, as I do verily think you can never answer, which makes you appear the most *partial* of any man I ever met with, for turning your *Bias*, to those *Abettors*, who (you confesse) have taken the *wrong way*. Or if this were otherwise, you could not prove you were *impartial*. For every *Skeptick* or *Seeker* can say as much, nay an Atheist may plead he is not *partial* to *any party*, because he professeth to joyn with *none*. Which things being considered, abstain for the future from *depredicating* your *self*, and defaming *others*. To what purpose is it that you publish *you are a Saint* (in one Book) and (now in another) that *you can boldly say you have attained to an impartiality in your Religion*, and again (in the same) that *you feel* [an excellent affection] *to reign within you, and that you will not conceal the work of God upon your soul*, and how your *soul is inclined when you let your prayers loose*, (p.7.) I say

* Look back on ch.4. Sect.4.

οὐκ ἀνεγγυαλῶς τῶν ἀσκεῖν σε. *Athan. περὶ παρθεν.* p. 1058. which compare with *a Sheet for the Ministery*, p.11.

say to what purpose does *your own mouth praise you*, when (if we may take *your own word* at another time) you * *cannot deserve* such *commendations?* How unfit was the *same mouth* to speak so *bitterly of Grotius*, as I have † shew'd you have done in another place? By your dealings with *him*, and the *Episcopal Divines*, I take the sense of your Conclusion to be but this, that *they* alone are *true Christians*, whom *you can love*. And if you love not *Grotius*, not the *Episcopal Divines*, the reason is, they are *no true Christians*.

* *Look back as ch 4. sect 5.*

† *Look back as ch. 1. sect. 13.*

Sect. 24. You say, *You had rather your right hand were ni'd as* Cranmer's, *then you should have written against* Puritanes *what I have done, Sect.* 24.] yet still you name not a *page* where I have done it, nor a *word* that I have spoken. Nor do you speak of the *Puritanes*, of whom I spake; or if you do, you are a Patron of impiety. If you would not have written as I have done, *against Puritanes*; how much less would I, as you, *against Episcopal Divines?* Have not I chosen, *so well* as you? Then follow *you* your *own* * course, and let *me* follow *mine*. If they were *Christians in deed*, whose *works* I shew'd you out of their *words*, the frighted Pagan will cry out, *Sit anima mea cum Philosophis*. And so perhaps some frighted Protestants, *Sint anima nostra cum Pontificiis*. But what will you say of your self, if you have written against *Puritanes*, at least as sharply as I have done? I know you have not given them that very *name*, but you have *lash'd* them *shrewdly* to whom the word *Puritane* of right belongs; which shews how little you have been scared with that *terrible saying of our Lord, Mat.* 18.6. which you apply in such sort, as if you understood not its *true importance*. For to rebuke men for sin, is not at all to *scandalize* them, in *Scripture phrase*, not in the phrase of any *Scholar* who knows the *English* of the word *Scandalum*. They are rather *scandalized* who have *pillowes sew'd under their* * *Armholes*, who are *flatter'd and commended, and soothed up in their sins. He that saith to the wicked, thou art righteous, him shall the people curse, nations shall abhor him*, Prov. 24. 24. To *offend*

A wilfull Impostare, or else a Patronage of Impiety.

* Καὶ οὐ ταῦτα δοκῶν τ' εἶναι, ἐμοὶ δ' τάδε.

* Ezek. 13. 18.

offend a little one, in English, is σκανδαλίζειν τὸν μικρὸν, in Scripture-Dialect. If you make men to sin by your *example*, or incourage them in sinning by your *instructions*, (as by instructing them to believe, that being once *Regenerate they cannot possibly be otherwise*, although their sins should be as *David's*, *deliberate Murder and Adultery*, &c.) you are truly said in such case, *to offend those little ones in the faith*, to *scandalize* them, to *gall* them, to make them *stumble*. See Dr. *Hamond* his learned Treatise concerning *Scandal*, if you are not too haughty for my *Advice*.

CHAP. VI.

Of Episcopal Divines, & the Archb. of Cant.

Sect. 1. THere is little remarkable in your *next Section*, but what hath been spoken to already; or what may be satisfied with very few words. You implicitely accuse me of *injustice in calling my book A vindication of Episcopal Divines from Mr.* Baxter, *Sect.* 25. whereas you cannot be ignorant, that I call'd my book by another name, Ἑαυτοτιμωρούμενος. And that the words which you mention, were only *a part* of the *General Contents* as far as a *Title-page* was fit to *hold* them. You might have said as truly, that I call'd my Book *A vindication of Mr.* Baxter *from Mr.* Barlee, for that was also *one part*, as your *eyes* can *witnesse*. 'Tis true I said in that Book, that *you spake in general against Episcopal Divines*, But I also said in your Vindication, That *your words were wrested beyond your meaning* (in being applied to *my particular*) *ch.* 3. *p.* 100. But now that I find you so unthankful for my brotherly dealing, I must tell you that my dealing was much more brotherly then you deserved. For when your words were so *general*, as to include the *Bishops*, *the Kings Chaplains*, *and other Doctors*, *who stay in England under the name of Episcopal Divines* to do the *Pope* the better Service; and when they were also so *particular*, as to point out for *Papists*, as firm *Protestants* as live, Bishop *Wren*, Bishop *Pierce*, &c. I know not how a *True Protestant* can misse your Censure, if

* Look back on *ch.* 1. *sect.* 6. towards the end.

if he performes the whole part of an *Episcopal Divine*, in so avowed a manner as to arrive at *your knowledge*. Nor can I think you will deny, that you include those *Prelatists*, who will *not approve* of your *Association*, by allowing a *meer Presbyter* the Prelatical Power to *excommunicate*. Which I believe will be allowed you by *no Episcopal Divine*; And then (forsooth) they must *all be Papists*.

You forgot your self much, when you directed me for Instruction about the *Bishop of Canterbury*, to the several Writings of Mr. *Prin*, his most exasperated *Enemy*, at that time of the day, when his *Eyes* were *not opened*, as *now* they *are*. But if you will read his *Rome's Master-piece*, you will see that pious Bishop designed to *Death* by the *Papists* (not to be *revenged* upon his being of *their side*, you may be sure, but) because they saw him too strong an *Enemy to Rome*; so far from helping on the *Introduction of Popery*, that they found it could *never* be *introduced*, so long as a *Primate* of his *Wisdome, Vigilance, Zeale to the Protestant Religion*, and the *Glory of God*, was permitted to enjoy both *Life and Greatnesse*. You talk of I know not what *matters of Fact*, which you must *specifie* first, before you *prove*. And you must doe your poore utmost to make some *proof*, before you can be fit for a *Confutation*.

Sequestrations misliked by their very Abettors.

Sect. 2. You begin your next Section, I should say in a *strange manner*, but that it is such as you are *used to*, and with which you have *forced* me to be *acquainted*. For you say [*I expresse with reproach and bitternesse my dislike of Ministers living on Sequestrations. And that you perceive I doe it without distinction. Sect.* 26.] But you produce not *one word* of *reproach or bitternesse*, nor refer to *any page*, where your Reader may *try* before he *trusts* you. Much lesse do you *shew* that I expresse my Dislike *without Distinction*. To have quoted my words had been *just*, but not at all for *your Interest*. For then your *Readers* would have found, that the * *reproachfull expressions* were but *repeated* by *me* from an *Eminent man* of *your own Tribe*. Who

* *See and consider my Self-revenger*, Exam. ch. 3. sect. 1. p. 69, 70.

 went

went away with my Reproof, for having us'd his *own party* with so much *Rigour*. Which yet I have since been sorry for, because he was of *my Judgment* in what he spake *against Sequestrations*; my *Dislike* of which is the same with *his*. And I will say in *his words*, that to *cast* a Brother out of his *Livelyhood*, or to *seize* upon that which is *anothers*, is an *unneighbourly*, *unscholarly*, *unchristian thing*. I am far from favouring any Minister, who is so *ignorant*, or *ungodly*, as you expresse. And I know there is a time when Ministers ought to be *suspended ab officio & beneficio*. But even *then* I must say, as Mr. *Barlee* hath done, I am for *justa justè*, and *Ecclesiastica Ecclesiasticè*. It is a very good Rule in the *Civil Law*, *Quæ à judice non legitimo, aut non legitimo modo facta sunt, ea præsumptionem habent contra se*. And such were our *late Sequestrations*, that although they were made by his beloved *long* * *Parliament*, yet M. *Hickman himself undertakes not in all things to acquit them*. (p.46.) And Mr. *B*. did avow in his very last Book, that *'twas a way he was not satisfied with*. (p.52.) Nay a very *great part* of their *proceedings you your self doe disown*, even in *this very Section*; Nay towards the end of your Book you professe your *detestation* of them (p.111.) And if *you* may *detest* what you haue *got so much by*, much more may I who have *lost* no *lesse*. Not to speak of *their* losses, who have been very dear to me, and *for* whose losses I was *afflicted*, when (I thank God for it) I was *not* afflicted for mine *own*; knowing *how*, and for *what*, and from what *sort* of *men* my sufferings came. Sequestrations are *scandalous* and *sinfull* things, when they proceed, and are *inflicted*, either a *non-Judice*, or in *non-Rem*, or *modo non debito* or *in finem non rectum*. The particular consideration of which *four* things, applied to all the *Sequestrations* which have happened within these eighteen years, would administer matter for a very just volume, had I time sufficient for such a work. Yet should I have spoken more largely then now I shall, (to give you that *information* which you particularly desire) were I not told of an able Gentleman, who hath sent a *Treatise* unto the Presse upon this *one subject*,

* Note, I speak with the vulgar, meaning onely the *two Houses* (as Mr. *Hickman* calls them p. 45.) or rather the *Remnant* of the two Houses, of which Judge *Jenkins* hath well inform'd us:

subject, and addressed it in *particular* to all *your wants*.

Sect.3. Whereas you say [*You are desirous to be better inform'd in this thing, to avoid much guilt, which else you may and doe incurre, if you be mistaken, sect.26.*] I have two or three things to return unto you. First, that as I am glad of your *good desire*, so I shall also be sorry if you are never the better for my Assistance. Next, for sufficient *Information*, I had thought it enough that you knew the *tenth Precept*, Non Concupisces, *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours house* (much less take it into *possession*, with all the good *land* that lies about it) *nor any thing that is thy neigebour's*, (much lesse *All* that is thy Neighbour's.) Of the Fundamental *Lawes* of this *land*, and the established *Canons* of the *Church*, I thought you had a sufficient knowledge. If not, you *may* when you *please*. Read but the Works of Judge *Jenkins*, whom God preserve from all Evil, and reward at last with a *Crown of Righteousnesse*. Read *Magna Charta*, and *the Petition of Right*. And compare with both, [a] *The Proclamation against the oppression of the Clergy by the Insurrection of factious and Schismaticall persons into their Cures, &c.* And compare with *all Three The Declaration of the Lord General and his Counsel of Officers, shewing the Grounds and Reasons for the Dissolution of the long Parlament*, 1653. You will find in the *three former* ["That the "Church, amonst others, hath these Priviledges; that re-"gularly no Ecclesiasticall Possessions can be extended, "separated, or sequestred, but by the *Ordinary*. That Di-"stresses may not be taken of Lands wherewith Churches "have been anciently endowed, and that Churches pre-"sentative cannot be filled, and the *lawfull Incumbent* "thereof removed, but by the *Ordinary*; not the Cure of "the Incumbents served by Curates, Lecturers, or others, "but by their *own Appointment*; or in their defect, by the "Appointment of the *Ordinary*. Not are any subjects of "the Laity, by the *Common Laws of this Realm*, capable "to take or receive Tithes (which are the Portion of the "Clergy) unlesse by *Demise from Them*, or such as are *ap-*

Sufficient Information for such as want and desire it.

[a] You may see a Copy of this in *Biblioth. Reg. part* 1 *fol.* 4. *num.* 10. *p.* 324.

"propriate, or made *Lay-fee*, &c. In the 28 *year of King* "*Edward the third* it was declared and enacted by Autho-"rity of *Parlament*, (which is also ratified in the *Petition* "*of Right*) *That no man of whatsoever estate or condition* "*be put out of his Land, or Tenements, nor taken, nor impri-*"*soned, nor disherited, nor put to death, without being* "*brought to answer by due Process of Law.* So by the Sta-"tute called [*The Great Charter of the Liberties of Engl.*] "it is declared and enacted, That *no Free-man* may be ta-"ken or imprisoned, or be *disseized of his Free-hold, or Li-*"*berties, or his free Customes*, or be *out-lawed*, or *exiled*, or "*in any manner destroyed*, but by the *lawfull judgement of his* "*Peers, or by the Law of the Land*, &c. Note that these are such Laws as are still in force by all confessions; they who have broken them the *most*, cannot pretend they have been *repealed*. You cannot object your *Scotish Covenant*, for you have written (a) *against That*. And if you had *not*, your case were *worse*. The *Remnant* of the *two Houses* you cannot urge, for the very same reasons, and many more. Nay since the writing of these words, those very *Houses* which did obtrude you upon *another man's Living* (or *Free-hold*) do now implicitely stand charged with the *Sin of Sacrileage*, as well by *your self*, as by Mr. *Vines*; as may be seen by *his* (b) *Letter* which you have printed, and by your words thereupon, in the page going before it. From hence consider very sadly, whether they who *transgressed* so much in *one* thing, doe not deserve your *suspicion* in many *others*. And now I will hope, you are sufficiently informed: if you *are* not, you *shall* be before I leave you.

(a) Plain Scr. proof of Infants Ch. mem. p. 123. which compare with 120, 121, 122. & with p. 274. and with your *Apen. to Aphor.* p. 107.

(b) Five Disp. of Ch. Gov. & Worsh. p. 350. 349.

Guilty men must keep their secrets, or not be angry that they are known.

But by the way let me tell you, that you were never in *my Thoughts*, when I expressed my *Dislike* of *Sequestrations*. I never knew you had any, untill you *told* me: Nor had I knowne it to *this houre*, had you but kept your owne *counsell*. So little Reason had you to use me with so much *Bitternesse* and *Virulence* in divers Books. But *worser* dealing then from *your selfe* (though not in print) I have had from a *Minister*

nister in *this very County*, of whose *Sequestration* I was as ignorant, as yet I am of his *Face*. I know him by nothing but his *Injuries*, and his *ill Name*, which I shall therefore in Charity *forbeare* to *publish*. I shot but at *Rovers*; and because by accident he was *hit*, he was as angry with the *Arrow*, as if it had been its own *Archer*, and vainly concluded that he was *aim'd* at, when (the very truth is) he onely stood in *Harms way*. These things put me in mind of a certain Proverb, which I heard a while since from a worthy man, *That 'tis dangerous speaking of a Halter in a jealous mans House, whose Father was hang'd.*

A sad plea for Injustice from an opinion that it is good.

Sect. 4. You proceed to tell me, *You must confess it your opinion that the thing is lawfull, and that you take it for one of the best things you can do, to help to cast out a bad Minister, and to get a better in the place, so that you preferre it as a work of mercy before much sacrifice.* Section 26.] Thus you *say* what you *think* (and whether you *thinke* as you *say*, God onely knowes.) But what Transgressor in the world may not say the same Thing? Will you doe *that thing* upon bare *opinion* that it is *good*, when the learnedst part of the Nation professe a *Knowledge* that it is *evil*? Let the most learned Dr. *Sanderson* be heard to speak in this matter, (as *exact* a *Casuist* as you can likely name any) and judge by that *one person* how many *thousands* and *millions* will vote against you. It should suffice to deterr you from taking that which is anothers, that the *lawfulness* of it is still in *controversie*; and even many of *your way* are (in this particular) of *ours*, blessing God with great joy, that they have never had the *least finger* in what you boast of. Besides you must *grant*, that it *may be* possibly a Sinne to deprive a man of his *Free-hold*; whereas *not* to deprive him, can be *no Sinne* at all. And whilest you call it your * *opinion* that you are *right*, you acknowledge it *possible* you may be *wrong*. From whence it also must needs proceed, that you profess to be *desirous to be better inform'd*. But then you should lay *down* the *stake*, untill you have found whose

* *Formido est de Intrinseca ratione Opinionis; quippe cui potest subesse dubium.*

whose reasons *win*. Not *dispossess* your Brother *first*, and then debate whether the action is *right*, or *wrong*. That hath too much affinity with *Hallifax Law*. Again consider how *sad* an *Argument* from *Opinion* to *Practise* some men have drawn; that whilest your own is *no other*, you may *suspect* it. The cursed Jews had *an* † *opinion*, that in *murdering Christ's Messengers* they *did God service*. Having also *an opinion*, that they were very *bad Ministers*. But certainly *one Injury* is no excuse for *another*. And since I * seek not *yours*, *but you* (which I also do at *your Intreaty*) be not offended if I put the case home. Can you take it for one of the *best works* you can do, to despoile a Brother of his lawfull possession, and then (over and above) to call him a *bad man*, thereby to justifie, or countenance the *Depradation*? Was Mr. *Dance* a *bad man*? 'Tis more then all my inquiries could yet discover. He hath a *better Report* then you can *comfortably* believe. And is not *his* That Benefice you now *possess*? Or if he is a *bad man*, Are you *better* then He, who have confessed your own † *Hypocrisie*, as well as *Pride*, whilest *sincerity* and *meekness* are most commended in M. *Dance*? How many hundreds are *cast out* from their several Places in the Church, who must be *granted* (even by *you*) to be exceedingly *good men*, at least exceedingly *better*, then those that are thrust into their Roomes? Who is now in the *Canonry of Christ-Church*, out of which Dr. *Sanderson* was rudely *cast*? Or who hath the *Parsonage* of *Penshurst* in his possession, out of which D. *Hammond* was long since *thrown*? You would blush if I should tell you *what change* is made. 'I do not instance in *these two*, as being better then all others (I cannot be so injurious to all their *Equals*) but because I think you may know them. Judge by these of the *rest*; which I will also *name*, if you *desire* it. But they would fill up too many sheets to be writ at this time. And as large as you may think me, I strive for *brevity* and *speed*. Let me ask therefore in short, If M. *Baxter* in *some* respects is a better man then some of his Brethren (who are not fit for *any* Livings, and yet are put into *other mens*) why not in *all* things, as well

† John 16. 2.

* 2 Cor. 12, 14.

† See your *Disp* 5. *of Sacr.* p. 484.

well as *some?* Why is he not better then his Brethren, in *abstaining* from the Enjoyment of that Revenue, which the *Law of the Land* hath as truly and solidly made *Another's*, as any *Lay-man's Free-hold* is *his*? Sir, I wish you so well, that I would have you as * *blameless* as good old *Zachary*: I would not have it in my power, to say an *unpleasant* thing to you: I long to see you a *Bright Example* of so *necessary* a Duty as *Restitution*. Hundreds may *follow*, if such a man will but *lead*. And when *Righteousness* shall *flow* as a *mighty stream*, it will probably carry in the same *channell* the most *desiderated* Blessings of *Peace* and *Union*. We who have Livings of our *own* will most readily *resign* them on that condition; and intercede with our *Patrons*, that such as give back their Brethren's may be *presented*. All shall be *theirs* (by my consent) who *most desire* to have All, if they will do us but the favour to take it *fairly*. I would not *wish* any thing *from* them, except their *Sins*. I could wish the *Lovers of this world* had as much of it as they could wish, could I but have any assurance that they would fare never the worse in a *world to come*. Not should I care by what *courses* a man grows *rich*, if Riches could do him any good *in the day of wrath*. Riches *restored* when *ill gotten*, I know to be profitable *for ever*, to those that want them *for a season* by such good means. Which strongly tempts me to *wish*, that I were just in *your case* (that is to say, *In a Sequestration*) that so I might be in a *capacity* of making an *eminent Restitution*, and of shewing the *way* unto my *Brethren* by that Example. Remember what you say of *Tithes*, when the *Quakers* accuse you of being *covetous*; [*The same Law of the Land that makes the Nine parts Theirs doth make the Tenth Ours. If we have no Title to the Tenth, they have none to the rest.*] The same Law of the Land is as good an Argument against *you* in the mouth of a Prelatist, as it can be in your mouth against the *Quakers*. And what was done by *one Ordinance* against the *Lands* of the *Bishops, Deans and Chapters*, &c. may as wel be done against *Tithes* by some *other Ordinance* or *Order*, the Law of the Land being as valid in one case as in another.

* ἀμέμπτος, Luke 1.6.

Prov. 11.4.

ther. If Mr. *Dance* may have a Trial by the Law of the Land, I know not how you can keep *his Living*.

Sequestrations disowned by their Defender.

Sect. 5. But you proceed to tell me, That *for the casting out of able, faithfull, godly Ministers, because they are Prelaticall, Presbyteriall, Independent, Arminians, or interested in the Civil Differences, this you utterly disown* Sect. 26.]

If you speak in good earnest, how then can you justifie the casting out any, by any means, unless by *that very Law*, by which it is granted they stood *possess'd*? Will you say in your defence that the Law is now changed; & that the *Committees for Ejection* can do the same things *now*, which onely the *Bishops and their Officers* could do *before*? But your *Concession* disinables you from saying *This*: For *then* as many as were concerned in the *civil Differences*, as opposing this *new Law*, might be *justly cast out* by your good leave, which you profess notwithstanding, that *you do utterly disown*. Nay *then* even *your self* must be acknowledged by *you self*, to be *justly expulsible* from the Living which you *possess*, for your *disowning and detesting* (and that in print) the several *Ordinances* and *Actions* of Them that thrust you into your *Living*. You cannot therefore say that the Law is changed: and being not able to say *that*, you must confess your *Sequestration* to be *illegall*: your Predecessor being not ejected, nor you succeeding into his Place by the *Law of the Land*, which is still in force. And which I have made it appear, you *unavoidably confess*: I therefore give you my solemn Thanks, for so *publickly disowning* all those *Parliamentary proceedings* against a multitude of as *learned* and as *godly* Protestant Divines (called common'y *Prelaticall*) as the Christian World hath ever had since the Times of *Luther*. Not onely those holy and learned Fathers of the Church, whom you may possibly call *Arminian*, but even those who have most of your own *Applause* (as Bishop *Morton*, Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Davenant*, Bishop *Prideaux*, Doctor *Oldsworth*, Doctor *Sanderson*, and so the rest) have been all *cast out*, as the *Dung of the Earth*, for no imaginable reason, but *the Civil Differences*

you

you speak of. None were ever ejected for being meerly *Presbyterial*, that I can think on. It having been quite another thing, for which Dr. *Reynolds* was so suddenly cast out of *Christ-Church*. How *Independents* may have suffered for being suspected to be *Arminians*, you may guesse by the partiall and shamefull dealings of the *Triers*, whom Mr. *Goodwin* hath displayed in his book on that subject. And had it not been for an *Army* which put a Hook into their *Nostrils*, the Presbyterians (in all likelyhood) had ruin'd All.

Accusations are of no value, when onely general, and without proof.

Sect.6. You tell me further, that *the casting out of the utterly insufficient, ungodly, unfaithful, scandalous, or any that do more harm then good, you take to be one of the most pious and charitable works, (supposing a better put in the place) that you can put your hand to, sect.26.*] But who (by name) are the *ungodly*, and all the rest of the *ugly things*, which here you call them in a breath? Mean you the *Readers of Common Prayer*, the Sons of *Order and Obedience*, who *stand fast* to their *Principles* in time of *trial*, and rather then be *perjur'd*, will gladly perish? Were I pleas'd to *recriminate*, perhaps I could make your ears *tingle*. But this is onely to inveigh against the *Prelatists* in general, as the *Quakers* do against *Presbyterians*; and by such practises as these, you *justifie* the *Quakers* against *your selves*. When you read me writing against the *Puritanes*, you read my *evidences*, and *reasons*, and undeniable *proofs*, & that from *matters of fact* which themselves have put upon *Record*. Consider your own words in their natural consequence; and then suppose that *Anabaptists* should prevail as much by the sword against *your party*, as yours hath done against *Episcopal Divines*; Casting you all out of the *Livings*, of which at present you are *possest*; and putting in *others* of their *persuasion*. Would they not plead for so doing, as you for the things that you have done? Would they not say that they had cast out the *insufficient*, and the *ungodly*, and put *better* into their *places*? and that this was one of the most *pious works* that they could possibly *put their hands to*? Did not the *Puritanes* in *Saxonie*, who threw down *Oratories*

and *Churches*, and *Church-men* too, as *Antichristian*, call themselves the *New Jerusalem*, *A holy people sent from God to deliver his Saints out of Egypt*, *the spiritual Egypt of Superstition*? Did they not enter into a *League of Association*, *to throw down all Scepters at the feet of Christ*, that themselves, being *the meek ones*, *might inherit the earth*? And did they not begin with greater *appearances of Godliness* then the men of your party have yet afforded? Or did you ever yet read of any *Persecutors in Christendom*, who oppressed the *just* as they were *just*, and not rather under the notion of the *unfaithfull and the ungodly*, that so they might seem *to set their hands to a pious work*? Nay did not the *Papists* say the same for their casting out the *Protestants* in the *Valleys of Piemont*, and the *Bohemian Churches* in the Kingdom of *Poland*, which you (who professe to be *Catholick*) do now alledge for the *ruining of English Protestants*? It is so easie to find a staffe for the beating of a Dog, and to reproach those *persons*, who are designed for a *Rejection*, that I wonder you can write at so low a rate.

An ill man may have a good title to his Estate, and must not be wrong'd for being unrighteous.

Again, consider your own Principle: you think *you cannot do better then to remove a bad man, that a better may come into his place*. As if the *worst* of men might not have *right* unto the *greatest* Estate or Possession, whilest the *best* have *no right*, unless it be unto the *least*. The veriest *Atheist* in the world may *lawfully* come by an *Estate*, whether by *gift*, or *purchase*, or *inheritance*; whilest godly *Lazarus* must thankfully enjoy his *scarceness*, and be content with those *crumbs* which daily fall from the *rich mans table*. He must not bid *Dives* come out of his *House*, & deliver up his *purple*, because they both are too good for so great a Sinner, but meekly stand or lie down at the Great mans *Door*. And therefore admitting they were *ungodly*, whom you have *helpt to cast out*, you should have turned them out of their *Rights*, before you had medled with their *Possessions*. Bishop *Hall* hath told you that God loves *Adverbs* better then *Adjectives*, the *Bene* better then the *Bonum*: *Good Deeds* may be abominable, if they are not *well done*. I

Luc. 16. 19, 20, 21.

am

am as willing as any other, that every *scandalous Minister* should be made to *reform*, or to *remove*. But if it must come to a *removal*, let his punishment be *legall*: let him *enjoy* the Law whilest he *endures* it. For even a *Murderer*, or a *Thief* hath certain *Priviledges* and *Rights*, both in the manner of his *Trial*, & *Execution*. It is an intolerable mistake, to think *the wicked cannot be wrong'd*, because they really deserve to be *soundly punisht*. And the mistake is no less, to think a man can be *godly* who *wrongs* the *wicked*: If the *Devil* himself hath any *Dues*, the Proverb tells us we must *allow* them; And we know there is *a case* wherein we may deal with him *unjustly*.

Again, let us take *another view* of your words. If you *cast out the bad*, and not by *Law*, your *putting in of a better* will nothing help you: for you must not do *any evil* that *any good* may come of it. God hath much a better way to be served then so; he hath *not* the least *need* of an *unrighteous man*, or of any one act of his *unrighteousness*. Were it lawful to perpetrate an evil act to a good end, we might laudably do wrong, and defraud our Brethren, that (like the true penitent *Zachaeus*) we might *restore four-fold*. This indeed would be as *charitable* and as *pious* an *injury* (if an injury can be such) as a man can set his *Heart* or his *Hand* unto: for we should make them the *richer* for having *robb'd* them. And out of the *evil* which we do, it is but just that we should draw the *utmost good* that we are able; which makes it customary to me, whenever I speak of *Repentance*, to press as hard as may be for *Restitution*: a point of greater consideration, then some may imagine till they are told. For if we would *Covenant with our Hearts*, (and be severe Covenant-keepers) to *restore no less then four-fold* to every man whom we *have injur'd*, or possibly *shall injure* from this time forward, our very *fear* of being *Banckrupt* would keep us *honest*. And such is the *crookedness* of our *nature*, (as we have made it) that we had need make use of some *moral Arts*, whereby to keep it in some due *straitness*.

Evil must not be done in pretence of good ends. Rom. 3. 8.

Eccles. 15. 12.

Sect. 7. This I say in Intuition of your very next words,

He who craves help must have the patience to receive it.

to wit [*that if you be mistaken in this, you should be glad of my help for your conviction; for you are still going on in the guilt.* Sect. 26.] This is now the *third time*, that you have called for my assistance, and given me encouragement in my attempt. God forbid I should refuse you my best endeavours of conviction, or dare to *dawb with untemper'd morter*; especially when you *urge* me to so much *Freedome*. And indeed, we *Shepherds* have extreme great *need of one another*, we are so apt to go *astray* into richer *Pastures* then our *own*. *David* was a *Prophet*, as well as a *Prince*; yet *Nathan* was fain to be sent to *David*, one Prophet unto another, nay a *lesser* Prophet unto a *greater*, and to *rouze* him out of his Sinne with a *down-right form* of Reprehension, *Tu es homo, Thou art the man.* Had I begun thus with *you*, Sir, you might have called it my *Rudenesse*, not my *Faithfulnesse to your Soule*. But it happily falls out, that you have discovered your selfe to *me*, when I had not the *power* to *discover* your selfe unto *your selfe*. You have said in effect, *Ego sum homo, I am the man.* And since you publickly avow, *you will be glad of my help*, I hope you will not be *angry* that I have *helpt* you.

2. Sam. 12. 7.

The shamefulnesse of Mr. White's Centuries.

Sect. 8. Whereas you say, *You need not go to Mr.* White's *Centuries to be acquainted with the qualities of the ejected*, Section 26.] I must shew you your Errour before I go a step farther. You speak of *Centuries* in the plural, whereas indeed there was but *one*: And that so *scandalous* a *Pamphlet*, that its Author was *ashamed* to pursue his Thoughts of any *other*. It was the Boast of Mr. *White* (as I was told by one, who will be as likely to tell you of it) that he and his had ejected 8000 Church-men in four or five yeares. And if *one hundred* of *eight thousand* had been as really *scandalous*, as that matchlesse *Pasquiller* was pleased to make them, it had not been so strange a thing, as that *One* of the *Twelve* should be a *Devil*, *one* hundred in *eight-score* hundred is exceedingly lesse then *one* in *twelve*. But Mr. *Fuller* him-

himself, however partiall to your party, (as our excellent Doctor *Heylin* hath made apparent) doth take himselfe up with a kind of doubt, that there might want *sufficient proof* to *convict* them of that they were accused of: and indeed there was wanting a *sufficiency of proof*, (a) *no witness coming in upon Oath to make good the Charge*. So that the utmost of that performance was but to treasure up wrath against the Day of wrath, and to make new sport for the *Protestants Enemies of Rome*, who did not spare to look upon that whole Businesse, as on an act of *Divine Retaliation*, in turning so many of the *regular and Orthodox Clergy* out of their *Rights*, by the violent hands of our new Reformers, under colour of some enormities of which they were forged to have been guilty; as the *Monks and Friars heretofore* were turned out of their Cells, with like *Inhumanity* (say the Papists) by those that founded our *Reformation*.

(a) See Exam. Hist. p. 256.

But now suppose it were very true, that many Episcopal Divines had been as *scandalous Livers*, as many *more Presbyterians* are known to be, they should have had a *legal Triall*, and have been *legally* devested of their Preferments, nor should men *more scandalous* have been commonly thrust into their places. Much *less* should many *swearing and illiterate Presbyterians* have been rewarded with these *spoyls*, which had been taken from *pious* and *learned* men. How many *Centuries* might be made of *debauched* creatures, who were not onely *not punisht*, but very carefully *preserved*, and *advanced* also, because they could *cotton* with the *Times*, and preach the people to *Disobedience*? Mr. *Fuller* himself hath paid you *home* with one Truth, *That his Majesty then at* Oxf. *would not give his consent, that such a Book should be written of the vicious lives of some Parliament Ministers, when such a thing was presented to him*. Whereby you see that vast *Difference* betwixt the *Spirit of Majesty*, and the impotent *spleen* of Mr. *White*.

Worse were put into Livings then the worst that were put out.

Sect. 9. You next go on to accuse whole *Countreys*, out of which the *Ejected* must all be *one* of your *two Heads*, and the

Unreasonable bitternesse to the Protestants, from one who would not befriend the Papists.

the *best* of them *profane*, and yet very *few* escap'd *Ejection*. Have you not written against *Popery* to very good purpose, against which your very sharpest Discharge was this, That you knew not hardly any *Papist*, but what was *Ignorant or Scandalous*, or some way ill? Now behold what you have done, even taken away the force of that your Argument against the *Papists*, by saying the same and somewhat worse of the *Protestant Ministers here in England*, who were violently cast out of their Livings, and that by men of their own *Profession*. *Some* (you say) *never preached*, (and if *others* had *never preached*, the Church of God had been happier then she hath been by their preaching for *Schism* & *Blood-shed*) *but read the Book of Common Prayer*; (and was not that better then some of *your preaching*, if you preach no better then you have printed, as you are said to *print* little but what you *preach*?) *Some* (you say) *preached worse then they that were never called preachers.* (How much worse did they preach, who preached against their own Governours, and blowed the *coles* of *Sedition* into a conquering *Flame*?) You say, and say onely, *That some understood not the Catechism, or Creed.* (But did they *better* understand it, who dream'd themselves able to *make a better*? To depart from such Evil is understanding. *Job* 28. 28.) You say that *many of them lived more in the Alehouse then in the Church, and used to lead their people in Drunkenness, Cursing, Swearing, Quarrelling, and other ungodly Practises, &c.* And thus you pour out your passion to a considerable part of your *Sect*. 26.

The Indefinite Accuser brought to his triall by some particulars.

But now it comes to my turn to propose a few things to your consideration. First, did the men of your party cast out none but such as these? Or was it for such things as these, that any Complier was ever ejected, who would but take the *Negative Oath*, the *Scotish Covenant*, *raile against the King and Bishops*, cry [*Curse ye Meroz*] or raise up good store of *loan upon publick Faith*? But let us come to some particulars, which may put your *Generals* out of *countenance*. I will but give you a *Specimen* in several kinds. Did Bishop *Hall never preach*? or Bishop *Duppa preach* worse

worse then they that were never called Preachers? Did not Bishop *Davenant understand his Catechism?* not Bishop *Morton his Creed?* yet how were They *spoyled* of their *Estates*, and clapt up *Prisoners in the* (a) *Tower*, whilest the most ignorant and the most scandalous had both their Livelyhoods and Liberties indulged to them? Of those that preached in the *Great City*, the first occurring to my mind were Doctor *Holdsworth*, D. *Hewel*, Doctor *Hacket*, Doctor *Heywood*, Doctor *Westfield*, Doctor *Walton*, Doctor *Featly*, and Doctor *Rives*; Doctor *Brough*, Doctor *Marsh*, Mr. *Shute*, Mr. *Hall*, and besides, the Reverend D. *Fuller*, now *Dean of Durham*; since the naming of whom I think of the Reverend Mr. *Udall*. These did not *live more in the Alehouse then in the Church*: The Fame of their *Piety* and their *Learning* is long since gone throughout the Churches: yet Mr. *Shute* was molested and *vexed to death*, and *dewied a Funeral Sermon to be preacht by Doctor* Holdsworth *as he desired*. Doctor *Holdsworth* was *cast out of his Mastership in Cambridge*, *sequestred* from his Benefice in the *City of London*, a long *time imprisoned* at *Ely House*, and the *Tower*. Doctor *Walton* (who hath put forth the late *Biblia Polyglotta*) was not onely *sequestred*, but *assaulted* also, and *plundered*, and *forced to flie*. Doctor *Rives*, Doctor *Hewel*, Doctor *Hacket*, and Mr. *Hall*, were *sequestred and plundered, and forced to fly for their lives*. *Doctor* Marsh *was sequestred and made to die in remote parts*. *Doctor* Brough *was plundered as well as sequestred, his wife and Children turn'd out of doors, and his Wife struck dead with grief*. *Doctor* Westfield *was sequestred, abused in the streets, and forced to fly*. *Doctor* Featly *was sequestred and plundered, and died a Prisoner*. *Doctor* Fuller *was sequestred and plundered*, and withall *imprisoned at* Ely House. *Mr.* Udal *was not onely sequestred himself, but his bed-rid wife was also cast out of doors, and inhumanely left in the open streets*. *Doctor* Heywood *was sequestred, and tost'd from prison to prison, put in the Counter*, Ely *House, and the Ships, his Wife and Children turn'd out of doors*. Could the Ejection of a few *scandalous, unlearned men* (supposing them *really such*, and

(a) Note, that of the 12. Bishops who were *voted* to the *Tower*, Bishop *Morton* & B. *Hall* at least were two.

regularly ejected) have made amends for such *Riots*, as were committed upon men of so exceeding great *worth*? Go from the *City* into the *Country*, and you will find the case the very same: Such venerable persons as Doctor *Gillingham*, Doctor *Hinchman*, Doctor *Mason*, and Doctor *Rauleigh*, Mr. *Sudberie*, Mr. *Threscrost*, Mr. *Simmons*, and Mr. *Farrington*, and a very great multitude of the like, (whom nothing but *want of Time* and love of Brevity doth make me forbear to reckon further) were used like *Dunces* and *Drunkards* (by your Reformers) though *powerful Preachers*, and *pious Men*; men so *eminent* for *learning*, and so *exemplary* for *life*, that 'tis scandalous to be *safe*, when *such* men suffer as Malefactors. To let you see briefly what it was, by which they were qualified for *Ruine*, I will tell you a story of Mr. *Simmons*, the most exemplary Pastor of *Rayn* in *Essex*, who being sent for up to the House of Commons by a Pursevant, was told, *That being an honest man, he did more prejudice to the good cause in hand then a hundred Knaves, and therefore would suffer accordingly*. So he did in great plenty his whole life after. And who should be sent into his place but a *scandalous Weaver*, who cannot *seemingly* be nam'd? Do but read that sober and useful Book, entitled *Anglia Ruina*, and then you will be likely to change your stile. If none had been thrown out of *Oxford*, but Doctor *Sheldon*, Doctor *Mansell*, Doctor *Sanderson*, Doctor *Hammond*; or none out of *Cambridge*, but Doctor *Lany*, Doctor *Brownrigg*, Doctor *Cosins*, and Doctor *Collins*, Mr. *Thorndike*, Mr. *Gunning*, Mr. *Oley*, and Mr. *Barrow*, no excuse could have been made for so great a Dishonour to Religion. But above all, let me commend a *famous passage* to your *remembrance*. Doctor *Stern*, Doctor *Martin*, Doctor *Beale*, men of eminent Integrity, exemplary Lives; and exceeding great Learning, and Heads of several Colledges in the University of *Cambridge*, were carried away Captives from thence to *London*, there thrust up into the *Tower*, thence removed to *another prison*; They often petitioned to be *heard*, and *brought to Judgement*, but could not obtain either *Liberty*, or *Triall*.

See Angliæ Ruina, or Mercurius Rustic.

After

After almost a years imprisonment, they were by order from the *House* put all on *ship-board*; (it was upon Friday *Aug.* 11. 1643.) No sooner came they to the *ship* call'd *The prosperous Sayler*, but straight they were *put under Hatches*, where the *Decks* were so *low*, as that they could not *stand upright*, and yet were denied *stools to sit on*, yea and a burden of *straw* whereon to *lie*. There were crowded up in that little *Vessel* no less then 80 *Prisoners of Quality*. Where that they might stifle one another, the very *Augur-holes* and *Inlets* of any *fresh Air* were very carefully stopp'd up. And what became of them after I have not heard. But let these things serve to make up my first consideration.

Secondly, Because you would make the world believe, that you have not onely made a *change*, but a *Reformation*, (worth more, you may be sure, then all the *Blood of the Christians* which hath been poured upon the earth, or then all the *money* which hath been spent, or then the *Widowes and Orphans* which have been made; or then the *Consciences and Souls* which have been ship-wrackt) I shall convince you of the contrary by the publick *Confession* of your *own party*, and by your *own confession* in particular. First the most eminent of your Brethren have unanimously confess'd to all the world. * *That in stead of true Pitty and Power of godliness, they had opened the very floodgates to all Impiety & Profaneness; & that after they had removed the Prelatical yoke from their shoulders by their covenanted endeavours, there was a rueful, deplorable & deformed face of the affairs of Religion — swarming with noysome Errors, Heresies & Blasphemies in stead of Faith and Truth; torn in pieces with destructive Schisms, Separations, Divisions & Subdivisions, in stead of Unity and Uniformity.* † *That in stead of a Reformation, they might say with sighs, what their Enemies said in scorn, they had a Deformation in Religion; and in stead of extirpation of Heresie, Schism, Profaneness, &c. they had an impudent & general inundation of all those Evils.*] Can you possibly have more (Sir) against the *change* in the *Church*, then here is publickly attested by them that *made it*? There were no such

A signal Confession That what is call'ed a Reformation was but a change unto the worse.

* *See the Testimony to the Truth of J.C. subscribed by the Ministers within the Province of Lond.*

P. 30.
P. 29.
P. 30.
P. 26.
† P. 31.

things in the *Bishops times*; nay none such could be. Gods *Inclosure* was then so *mounded* with a Hedge of *Discipline and Order*; and even the Hedge was so *fenced* with a double *Wall* of *Law* and *Canon*, that either no uncleane Beasts could enter in, or if they did, they were soon cast out and *impounded*.. Our Saviour noted him for a *Fool*, who should begin to *build* what he could not *finish*. What then is *He*, who *pulls down* what is *built*, that he may build it up in a better Frame, when he is not assured he shall be able to *begin*, much less to *finish* his *new Design*? You now profess (a) *you are all for Bishops*, but when you *had* them, you would have *none*. How very *little* of your *Presbytery* had you *erected*, when (blessed be God) you were restrained by better men then your selves? And yet your Brethren have confessed a good Confession, (they say they do it with *Sighs*, I would it were with *Sincerity*) that in stead of *Reformation*, (which was fairly promised unto the people) *a Deformation in Religion* is most conspicuous. Agreeable to this, I find you saying to Mr. *Tombs* [*That Satan in these times hath transformed himself into an Angel of Light* (Is the Devil himself turn'd Puritane?) *And his servants into Ministers of light, and hath deceived men so far, that there is scarce an Error so vile, but it pretended to proceed from Glorious light. I see also that this Cancer is a fretting and growing evil.* —(b) *Some are zealously preaching against the Godhead of Christ; and some of them are grown so far, that the Parlament is fain to make an Act lately against them that call themselves God, and that say, Whoredom, Murder, &c. are no sins, but he is likest God that committeth them, &c.* — *I hope their zeal will at last be raised a little*, (you speak this of your *own* Parlament) *to befriend Christ the Mediator, as well as God the Creator; And to put in one Clause against them that shall deny Christ to be come in the Flesh, or deny his Godhead, or that make a scorn of him openly, or that prefer* Mahomet *before him, or that call the Scripture a bundle of Lies, &c. I hope at last they will not only honour the Father, but kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and they perish in the way.*] ;

D'sp. of Ch. Gov. and Worship. p. 275. &c.

See your Pl. Scr. Pr. of Inf. Ch. Memb. & Bapt. Edit. 1. p. 274.

(b) Note that this you speak of these men whom you call Mr. *Tombs his Brethren*, who were at first against nothing but *Inf. Bapt.*

Now

Now Sir, consider what you have said, (and printed in the year 1651.) in recounting these *Fruits* of your *Reformation*. Consider what you say of your very Parlament. You hope their zeal will *at last* be raised, (as if till *then* it had not been,) and at last be raised *a little*, (as if till then it were *none at all*) and to *befriend Christ the Mediator*, (as if they *wanted* even a *zeal* for *Christianity it self*.) And you hope *at last* they will honour the *Son too*, (as if *till then* they had honoured the *Father only*.) Now this being compared with your other Confessions, (*a*) That many things in the *Common Prayer, and Rubrick, and Canons of the Church, were Excellent and Necessary, and therefore unjustly laid down*; *That plain Duties were wiped out, and the Directory more defective then the Common Prayer*; *That those* [*excellent*] *things were taken from us which we were in actual possession of, for that the substance of these was in the Common Pr. That you have cause to repent of your Nationall Covenant, as conteining in it things Politicall and Controversiall*; (for this you know is the summe of what you say in those pages, wherein a man would have thought you somewhat *Prelatically* affected;) Methinks you should easily be perswaded to lay aside your *Vatinian hatred* of the Episcopal Divines, and allow them to be *constant unwavering men*. If there were nothing else with me to make me love mine own *Principles*, The Notable *Mixtures* in your Books would *force* me to it.

Presbyterian Confessions to the advantage of the Prelatists.

(*a*) Ibid p. 120.

P. 123.

P. 123.

Thirdly, Consider what you have said, as touching *Episcopacy in the Nationall Covenant*, that *it is one of the smaller and controvertible points*; And that you would *not have such a Covn. rashly imposed upon the Churches*. Yet you know very well, both by whom it was *taken*, and by whom it was *imposed*, and what they suffered who did *refuse* it. 'Twas not for *swearing*, (as you pretended) that men were *cast* out of their Livings, but chiefly because they would *not swear*. And now your self have well *absolv'd* them, when it was said by (*b*) Mr. *Nye*, (whom I need but name, *Cætera Fama dabit*,) That the National Covenant was *such an Oath, as for Matter, Persons, and other Circumstances, the like*

The National Cov. confessed faulty. Ibid. p. 121.

(*b*) *Cov. with Narrative.* p. 12

like hath not been in any Age or Oath we read of in sacred or humane Stories: his meaning certainly should have been, That it is absolutely *the worst that ever was*. For if he meant it was the *best* (even the *best* we read of in *sacred stories*) the man was *blasphemous beyond Example*. And however I do not doubt, but that some *Prelatists in judgement* were *Anti-prelatists in practise*, by either quarrelling, or cursing, like any *Puritanes*; and that some *Drunkards* might be Episcopal, as well as others *Presbyterian*; yet I conceive you must yield, that to *impose such a Covenant* is a greater Sin then to be *drunk*. And let this suffice to have been spoken to your *indefinite Accusations*.

A strange way of arguing in the behalf of Cruelty.

Sect. 10. To the rest of your Section (as being but a *Tautology*) I shall return in fewer *words*. [*You think it a charity to Souls, and honour to Christ, and the Church, and Gospel, to cast out these men till they be reformed.* And your reason is, *Because you are a Christian, and believe there is a God.* Sect. 26.] A very fine Argument. Because Mr. *Baxter* is a *Christian*, he must be a *Ruler and a Judge*, and cast out men (who are his Equals at least) from their *undoubted possessions*, as well as his *Bishops and Superiours*, whom God hath set *over him*. And who was ever sequestred from his *Parsonage*, or *Prebendary*, or *Fellowship*, or the like, *untill the time of his Reformation*? There was an eminent person *cast out* of his place for once *not taking the Engagement*, when yet the *taking of it Twice* was not sufficient to *cast* him *in*. Reform, or not Reform, a man is sequestred *durante vitâ*. And so you speak of Sequestrations; not as they *are*, but as they *should* be, in *your Opinion*.

Its consequence subversive to all humane Society.

Your reason why *others more fit must be put in their Places and have the maintenance, is, because the maintenance is for the Ministry, &c.* Sect. 26.] But how comes the *fifth part* to be allotted for the *Owner* who is *ejected*? If he was an *usurper*, why is he gratified so far? if no *usurper*, it is his *Right*. And how doth such a man, by his supposed viciousness lose his *Right* to the maintenance

nance which once he had? Does any Landlord, by being a *Swearer* or a *Drunkard*, *eo ipso* cease to have a *right* unto his *Manor*, or his *Rents*? Consider well to what this *tends*. Let a man live never so *warily*, yet if he is *rich* he shall be *guilty*; though if he is *poor* enough to be safe, he may pass for an innocent, or *godly* man. I am so weary of this stuff, that I will hasten to a Conclusion. For untill you can take away a *right*, all you say is worth nothing. Your saying that a *mans viciousnesse doth make him cease to have a Right, is very equivocal*; and being taken in the most *obvious sense*, implies an Errour extremely *dangerous*. For it tends to the subversion of all Humane Society. Every man being so *vicious*, as to lose his *right* to an *estate*, in the judgement of *such* Neighbours as are *willing* and *able* to take it from him. And since you frequently desire to be *better informed* (implying you *want* information, in as much as you *desire* it) you must be taught to distinguish between the *justice of a Person*, and the *justice of a Possession*. He is no *just person* who doth not truly serve God; yet a *just Possessor* of those Things, which he holds by a *Title* the *Lawes approve of*. The *confounding* of which things, *Grotius* tells you, was *rightly condemned in* Wickliff. *For if the Vessels of Election have a right to those things which the Reprobates have in their possession, it followes that the Elect may challenge all as their portion.* But then the strongest *Arm*, and the longest *Sword* will be sure to *judge*, and to *stare* the Difference. The *weakest*, and the most *plunderable*, will ever pass for the *vicious*, and so for the *reprobated party*, who *cease* from *having right* to the *Creature-comforts*, if yet they may be said to have ever *had* it. For towards the close of your Paragraph

Aliud est de possessionis justitiâ agere, aliud de personæ... Est hoc inter ea, quæ in *Wiclifo* damnata sunt; & recte sanè. Nam si electi ad eas res, quas homines rejecti possident, jus nunc habent, sequitur, ut eas res vindicare possint. *Grot. Discuss.* p. 93.

Sect. 11. You profess *to think* (a strange thing) *That so long as the fore-described men did keep their Church-maintenance, they were usurpers before God; and therefore that they are bound, if possible, to make restitution of all the Tithes or other maintenance that ever they received (while they were such)*

Concerning usurpers and Restitution.

as

as truly as if they had broke mens houses for it, or robbed them by the high way. Sec. 26.] This doth prompt me to a *Dilemma* concerning your *own Predecessor*, whose *sequestred Freehold* you have possessed for some years. He was one of your *fore-described* men, or he was *not*. If he *was*, it must be *proved*, before he can *lawfully be condemned*: If he was *not*, with what Conscience can you *approve* by your *practise*, what in divers pages you have *detested* with your *Pen*? After the utmost enquiry I have been able to make, I hear a much better Character of your *ejected Predecessor* then of *your self*. But now supposing him to be one of your *fore-described* men, I am to ask you this question. To *whom* must he make *that Restitution* of which you speak, for all the years during which he enjoyed his *Benefice*? You, who lay the Obligation as far as it is *possible*, (and so by consequence as far as his *present fifth part* at least will go) ought to have shew'd him the *very place* in which the payment is to be made; whether in any Neighbour's *House*, or rather in the *Church-porch*. You should have nam'd the *person* also, who is to receive the *Restitution*; whether *your self*, who have the profits arising out of his Sequestration, or the several *Church-wardens* in former years, or the respective *Parishoners* who pay'd his Tithes, all the while that he did them more *hurt then good*. (For so you suppose him to have done, whilest you compare him to the *Physitian that takes money for killing men by ignorant applications, poysons, or neglect*.) Again you should have shew'd, what kind of *death* such *Ministers* are *bound to die*. For if they are bound to *restitution, as truly, as if they had broken mens houses, or robbed by the high way*, (which is your peremptory assertion,) what can free them from other *punishments* which bear proportion to their *offences*? Nay do you not charge your own *Committees* with great *injustice*, for allowing such *haiwou Malefactors* a *fifth part* of that Revenue, even *after* the time of their Sequestration, of which you pronounce them to have been *Usurpers*, even *before* they were sequestred? I perceive you think it not enough, that your Predecessor hath *lost* what you have *gotten* into

possession,

possession, unless you may be freed from paying back the *fifth part*. Nor can *that* content you neither, unless he will *antedate* his *Sequestration*, and restore *all the Tithes that ever he had received*, be it twenty or thirty years before the least Accusation was fram'd against him. Nor can you deny what I say, but by *denying* your *willingness* that men should *repent* and do their *Duties*. For you say they were *Usurpers, and are bound to make Restitution*. By which it appears what you would have, had you the *power of the Sword*; and how ill you were qualified to say of *Grotius*, that his design had a tendency *to engage the Princes of Christendom in a persecution of their Subjects*, p.17. I might here examine (had I but leisure) *what restitution* is to be made by such as have usurped their *Neighbours Livings*, if you require it so strictly from such as were scandalous in *their own*. And how you can pay a *fifth part* to so *intolerable* a person, as your Book hath concluded your Predecessor. And what *Restitution* you will allow to the most *eminently learned and godly* men in the Ministery, who have been *cast* out of their *Houses*, and for ever *deprived* of their *Revenues*, for nothing else but their *care* to keep *God* and a good *Conscience*. And why you approve of those men who placed *your self* where you *are*, whilest you professedly *detest* so great a part of their *Proceedings*. And whether the *Drunkards* (as you call them) might not be some of *your* (a) *godly men* (though none of *ours*) to whom you have indulged so great a *priviledge*, as to be *worse then Drunkards*, yet *godly* still. Compare your Description of *sequestred Ministers* with the Characters you have given of *godly people*, and at least you will wish for a *better memory*, if you doe not make use of a *slower pen*.

(a) *Look back on* ch.3.sect.1, 2, &c.

*Sect.*12. To your conclusion I answer, that I would not have *any* Minister either *ignorant*, *scandalous*, or *insufficient*, to enjoy the *least Benefice* within the Church. But 1. I would have them *exactly tried before they are censured and condemned*, lest the most *able and pious* men be taken away by a *pretence*. 2. I would have them *severely*, but *justly* dealt

What Sequestrations are disliked, and what not.

dealt with, and precisely according to *Law established*. 3. I would not have *the* * *righteous destroyed with the wicked*; much less that *twelve* such as *Peter*, and *James*, and *John*, (with an humble distance in the comparison) should be cast as *dung* out of the Church, for *one* or *two* such as *Judas*, cast as dung out of the same. 4. I would not have even the *scandalous* or *insufficient* so ejected, as that others *more* scandalous, & *less* sufficient should be obtruded in their Rooms. 5. Much less would I have notorious *Drunkards*, or *Dunces*, usurp the Rights of the most *pious* and *learned* men. 6. I would have the word *scandalous* to be duly *applied* and *understood*, knowing that many are *no Drunkards*, who yet are *more scandalous* then if they *were*. The *Devil* himself is *no Drunkard*; but he is *proud*, and *envious*, and *hypocriticall*, *rebellious*, *sacrilegious*, and many other wayes *worse* then a common *Drunkard*. His *frequenting* the *Church*, and *transforming himself into an Angel of Light*, appearing *like* a *Saint*, and putting on *Godlinesse* for a *Disguise*, doth make him *much more scandalous* then he could *possibly* be, if he could be *drunk*. Remember what I told you concerning *scandall*, both the *word* and the *thing*. Which compare with *Matth.24.5.24. 2 Cor.11.13,14,15.* Lastly, although a *Drunkard* is so detestable a thing, as not to deserve a toleration in the meanest of the *people*, much less *impunity* or *connivence* in any *Priest*, yet I would not have him punisht more for his *judgement*, then his *life*, (as I can *prove* many have been) because a *Drunkard* may be *Orthodox*, and a *dry* man may be an *Heretick*. A Drunkard may be *loyall* to Gods Anoynted, whilest one who *never* was drunk may be a *Rebell*. Nor can I think it *praise-worthy*, *Ad Rempublicam perdendam* (aut Ecclesiam) *sobrium accedere*. And when a *Drunkard* is *sequestred*, not at all for being a *drunkard*, but either for refusing to swear a *new Oath* (such as was your *solemn Covenant*) or for somewhat else which is the *best* thing in him, and for which the *holiest men* have been sequestred as well as he, I know not how you can *excuse* it. If the *Papists* shall condemn a *drunken Protestant* to the *Fire*, for meerly refusing to renounce being a *Protestant*,

* Gen. 18.23. 25.

Protestant, you will (I doubt not) allow him the Reputation of a *Martyr*. I pray consider the particulars of this last Paragraph. And when by *accident*, or *choice*, you speak *confusedly* of any subject, doe not take it in ill part, in case I help you to a *Distinction*.

Sect. 13. Your 27. *Sect.* which next ensues, hath so little of what is pertinent or *materiall* in it, and so indecently much of what is *personal*, that a very *short Answer* will serve its turn. 1. If you had cited the very *page*, or at least the *Chapter*, where I spake of some persons who were known to *grow Lusty on Sequestrations*, you should have had such an accompt, as you had rather have been without. 2. Your *Paralipsis* was a mark of your greatest *policy*; because if I had grown *lusty*, it had been onely upon *mine own*. And so for your want of a *Retortion* I think your *weakness*, but not your *will*; for even by saying what you *will not say*, you shew your *woulding* concerning *me*, as before you had done concerning *Grotius*. 3. That you are *below some of your brethren*, it is enough that you have told me without my asking; I am not concern'd to contradict you. Yet some may say you contradict your *own self*, because you adde you would *presently* quit the Place that you are in, if a *probable evidence* could be given you of *a Better supply*. Every Usurper may say as much, if he is but well qualified with a *haughty opinion of Himself*. 4. You tell me what you would do, *if you know what is in your heart*. But having confessed to Mr. *Tombes*, that your *Heart is desperately wicked*, and having confessed to Dr. *Owen*, that *Hypocrisy* and *Selfishness* and *Pride* are in it, I am not the wiser for what you tell me, unless you can give me some kind of Evidence that *you know your own heart*. 5. The more you have Declared your being *Selfish*, the less I can believe of your *Self-denialls*. How men do *value* their *Sequestrations*, 'Tis best to judge by their *Actions*, and not their *Words*. If the *Flock* were in their Eye, and not the *Fleece*, less Revenues would content them, then what they are known to have seiz'd upon. Hath not the *Richness* of the Living been in lieu of *Malignancy* to the

Of growing lusty on Sequestrations.

best *Divines* of our Church, whilst the *Poverty* of others hath afforded *Protection* to their Incumbents? 6. Let every man Injoy his *own*, untill he be *legally dispossest*, and then I doubt not but your Abilities will quickly commend you to a *Living*, as good as that which you *possesse*. But how full or how void of *Self-deniall* your brethren are, I cannot judge by your Example. Nor will I judge of your own, but by your *Practice*. Men may *talk* what they please, because their *Tounges are their own*: But when God hath said plainly, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbours House*, It cannot enter into my Thoughts, how a man can *invade* it without *Coveting*, or how he can *covet* with *Self-deniall*, whilst he so far *covet's*, as to *invade* it.

CHAP. VII.

A confessed mentyla.

Sect. 1. HAving done with *Sequestrations*, you *interpose* in a *Controversy*, in which (you make your confession, that) *you find no Call to interpose. Sect.* 28.] But still it seems you have a *courage* to engage your Pen in those *Quarrels*, for which you have not a *Call*, or a *Qualification*. Had you not caught a kind of *Itch* at your *Fingers Ends*, you would not probably have imployd them in such a *wilful mentyla*. For you having not a *Call*, I take *your* word; and you may please to take *mine*, for your not having a *Qualification*. How *much*, or how *little* you understand of the *Synod* at *Dort*, and the several Parties of the *Calvinists*, who do resolve either to *follow*, or *not* at least to *contradict* it, I should have taken upon me to make you see, if you had not made That the peculiar Province of *Tilenus*; whose Publication of your Failings coming yesterday to my hands, makes me willing to *ridd* them of this Employment.

The Synodists unexcusable by standing out after yielding.

Sect. 2. If it is true, what you say, *That the Calvinists do extend the mercy of God, and the merits, sufferings, and Grace of Christ, as much to All, as I do*, (Sect. 28.) *And confess that God hath from eternity decreed, that Faith and repen-*

repentance shall be the Conditions of Life, and that none but the perseverings shall be saved, (Sect. 29.) *That the sins of all the whole world were laid on Christ, who procured a grant and offer of pardon and life to all, on condition of Faith and repentance*, (Sect. 30.) *That all men (who hear the Gospel at least) have so much grace bestow'd from Christ, as that the matter is brought to the choice of their own wills, whether they will have Christ, or not*, (Sect. 31.) *And lastly that God giveth all men to persevere if they will*, (Sect. 32.) Then what excuse can the *Synodists* and other *Calvinists* make, for writing so much in *contradiction* to what they acknowledge to be *true*? Why do they plead with so much fierceness, that the *Decree* of Reprobation was *irrespective*, which they evince to have been otherwise, by their confession that Christ hath purchased a *Salvability* for *all men*? Why do they *persecute* their Brethren under the Notion of *Arminians*? Why do they *Couple* them with the *Jesuites*, by way of *contumely* and *reproach*, whilst they acknowledge so neer a *parallel* betwixt the *Jesuites* and *themselves*? How come *you* and your own *Brethren* to pursue each other with so much *virulence*, if you do all agree so fully with the *Synod* at *Dort*? Or what meant the *Synod* in falling so foule on the *Remonstrants*, for meerly holding such Tenets as were but the *sequels* of their *own*, if their *own* were such as you here *describe*? If they were *not*, you must eat your own *words*, which you will find (in the *Digestion*) exceeding windy. If they *were*, I am glad that all our Dissentions are at an end, and admire the *Evidence* of the *Truth* which extorts a *submission* from her *Opposers*.

Sect. 3. I shall not quarrel with *their opinion*, who say that God, in giving *Grace*, gives *more* to *some* than *sufficient*, provided that *That* which he gives to *all* be very *really sufficient*; and that the *overplus* be not such, as for the want of which no man is able to *come in* and *receive his Saviour*: for if it is, it will follow, that none is *really* and *truly* sufficient Grace, but what is sufficient and somewhat *more*. Instead of inlarging upon *This*, I do solemnly re-

commend it to your most serious consideration. For here lies the *point*, at which we are *parted* from one another. When some men have *acknowledged sufficient Grace* unto *All*, (driven to it by the *absurdities* which they find would fall on their *Denial*) They are so terrified with the Thought of going over to their *Antagonists*, (whom they have customarily branded with the Title of *Arminians*,) that they interpret the word *sufficient* into the importance of unsufficient: for they declare it to be *impossible*, that *sufficient Grace* should be *available* to the receiving and retaining of Jesus Christ, without the addition of somewhat else, which you call *the will and perseverance it self*, (Sect. 23.) which however it implies a *contradiction in Adjecto*, (as that the Grace which is *sufficient* is *not sufficient*) yet they resolutely swallow so huge a *Camel*, because they strain at the *Gnat* of seeming to be the *Converts* of their *Opponents*. They will not be thought to be *convinced* by Them: they *Hate*.

Again, let it be granted, that whilst *all* have *sufficient*, some *few* have *more*; upon condition it be proved from *God's own word*, that to *all* his *Elect* he give's this *more*; or at least that it be granted, (in default of such Proof) That a man *may be saved by Grace sufficient*, Let *Salvability for all* (which you frequently acknowledge) be allow'd to signifie what it does, to wit a *possibility that all may be saved*. And then let nothing be subjoyned for the placing of any under an *impossible*, for fear of implying a *Contradiction*.

Austin confessedly against the Synod of Dort.

Sect. 4. Whereas you grant it to be true, *That Augustine thought The Elect onely do eventually persevere, and some who are Sanctified, but not Elect, do fall away*, to which you adde, *that the Synod do judge otherwise*, (Sect. 33.) First I observe a good confession, that St. *Austin* was for *that*, which you call *Arminian*, against your Dear *self*, and the *Synod* of *Dort*. Which makes me wish that all *Calvinists* would either *accept* of St. *Austin*, when we urge him speaking against *Themselves*; or at least *not urge* him, when they imagin him speaking to their advantage. Secondly. If the

the *Synod* does *judge otherwise*, as to the *former* part of St. *Austin*, they judge that men may be *saved* who were *never Elected* unto *life*, or else that men may *persevere*, and yet *not* be *saved*. But if the Synod does *judge otherwise*, as to the *later* part of St. *Austin*; They judge that *all* who are *sanctified* are also *absolutly elected*, from whence they incur this great *Absurdity*, (in case St. *Austin* be in the Right) That men may be *absolutely Elected*, and yet *eventually condemn'd*. Which also implyes this other Absurdity, That God's Decree can be *absolute*, yet *not immutable*. Which again imply's a *Contradiction*.

Sect. 5. They do not truly *extend Grace further*, who extend it to *fewer* then others do. And you know *that Grace* which here you speak of is onely extended by the Synodists to the *smallest part* of mankind, which prove's your expression not rightly chosen. (Sect. 33.) I will thank the Synodists, as for a *Favour*, if they *abstein* from doing *wrong* to any. But yet I will aske, by what *Text* they are so *liberall* to a *few*. Your two propositions are impertinent to that very end for which you use them. For the Grace of God and his goodness is advanced especially in this, That he is wanting to *none*, who are not *first provokers* of him by being wanting unto *themselves*, and that he give's *sufficient* Grace to *persevere*, even to them who are not found to reduce their *Ability* into *Act*.

The Extent of Grace.

Sect. 6. Whilst you *think you may conclude, that the Synod give's as much as the Arminians or Jesuites to universall Grace, both in Decree, Redemption, and execution by collation of Grace.* (Sect. 34.) Implying how very reconcileable the *Jesuites* are with either sort of *Presbyterians*, the followers of *Arminius*, and *Calvin* too; I wonder why you *beseech me to judge impartially, whether it be Christian dealing to give out, that they do by the restraint of Grace, make God a Tyrant, a Dissembler, with abundance of the like*, (Sect. 35.) For I call your own *Conscience* and *Eyes* to witness, (your *Eyes*, in case you have *read* my writings, and your *Conscience*, if you have *not*, as well as if you have,) That I never laid any such charge upon those that grant

The Synod of Dort parallel'd with the Jesuites even by them that plead for them.

sufficient

sufficient Grace unto All. For then I should have laid it upon my self. But if they who *grant* it in *one* place, do also *deny* it in an *another*, (as the Gnosticks by turnes did both *own*, and *disown* our blessed Saviour as they found it most for their present purpose,) their *self-Contradictions* must not excuse them. The Absurdities which I charge, I charge on them who *deny* sufficient Grace unto all, and when I *catch* them in the *Act* of their bold Deniall, I cite their *words* and their *pages*, and condemn them out of their *own Mouthes*. Which honest course would you have taken, you could not have publish't so many Books. Every five or six daies may well produce a New volume, from any man of any Trade who dare's to write out of his *Fancy*. I pray Sir consider the wrong you do me, and how your Readers may be *mistaken*, concerning *me*, by your Means. Although I heartily *forgive* you, yet I beseech you do so no more. But either resolve *not* to *meddle* with what I have sent into the *light*, or at least produce my *words* and *pages*.

The Denial of original pravity falsely charged on the Remonstrants.

Sect. 7. As to your 36. *Section*, I perceive you are fain under the Hand of *Tilenus*, And so I will not oppress you whilst you are *sucking*. Yet because you call him *my Tilenus*, (which I take for an *honour*, however you cannot so *intend* it,) I shall observe a few things which I find he passed by, as not sufficiently deserving his *Time* and *Paper*. VVhy do you charge the *Remonstrants*, or Presbyterian Followers of *Arminius*, (for *they*, you know, were the great *Adversaries* of the *Synod at Dort*, with the Error of *denying Original Pravity*? Consult their writings, and then repent of this Rashness. If I am able to *sound* you, I discover the *bottom* of your Contrivance. The *sufficient Grace* that is given, you allow to *Adam* to have been *really sufficient*, or to those that are *exempted* from a state of *Depravation*. But this is onely a Trick, whereby to *retaine* the word *sufficient*, whilst you *let go* your *hold* of its *signification*, which make's you *fit* to be *interrogated afresh*. VVhen you say that God hath given *sufficient Grace unto All*, do you mean it is *sufficient* to *depraved Nature*? sufficient for the bringing of

every

every Son of *lapsed Adam* (who shall not be wanting into himself) into a *state of salvation*? Else, what did your *former* Concessions mean? Did Christ dye for Adam whilst yet *unsaven*, whereby to procure his *salvability*? Or did he not rather dye for *those* who were *dead in Adam*, whereby to *restore* them to life and safety? If he did it *not sufficiently* for all mankind, what did he for them? But if he did this *sufficiently*, your Synodists *Opponents* desire no more.

How much there is in the will of man.

Sect. 8. To your Remarkable *Question* on which you lay a great stress, [*Is there any thing in the will besides a naturall Power or Faculty, and an Habit, Disposition or Inclination to Act, and the Act it selfe?* Sect. 36.] I answer, *yes*. There is somewhat else besides those *three*, to wit *sufficient strength*, or *grace given*, or at least on God's part *ready to be given* [non ponentibus obicem] to all that stand not in their own light. But this is neither a *natural Power*, (for tis a *spiritual*) nor an *Habit of Grace*, (for before it can be such, it must be *received* and *rooted* too,) Nor yet a bare *disposition or Inclination* to act, (for *that* may be without strength to go *thorow*) nor the *Act it self*, (For we know it is clearly *precedent* to it.) You did therefore say well, that you *knew no more*. For things may very well *be*, and yet be seated beyond your *Knowledg*.

Cannot, and *will not*, are not one and the same thing, as you affirme (Sect. 36.) For what a man *will not* is consistent with what he *Can*, and thence it is, that *wilfull* Sins are the *greatest*. But to say, he *cannot* do what he *can*, is to imply a *Contradiction*.

To convert a sinner no breach of charity.

Sect. 9. How *uncharitably* soever it pleased your passion to suggest, (Sect. 37.) I shut out None from my *Peace* and *Charity*, though you and others would shut me out from the Peace and Charity of the world. To endeavour their Conversion, who affirm that God hath a *chief hand in sin*, And that *sin it self* (if a *positive Entity*) *must either be God, or God's Creature*, will be esteemed by the judicious as the strongest Argument of my *Love*.

* I shall be glad to know the Reason, by which you were moved to call him *Mine*.

Can you believe it a want of *Love*, that so unpassionate a writer as * *my Tilenus* thought fit *to Antidote* the Readers of

of Mr. *Bagshaw's two Sermons*, supposing the *Dedicatory Epistle* might hardly be An[illegible]ote enough? Or was it (think you) his want of Charity either to *you*, or Mr. *Hickman*, which made him publish the *Impiety* of *both* your *Doctrins*? I am as confident as of any thing, of which I have not a perfect knowledg, that he had nothing in his *Eye* but the *Publick Good*. Yet what you *now* say of *me*, you will be as likely to say of *him*, and so of our Excellent Dr. *Gauden*, or indeed of any man else, who either *confuteth* what you are *for*, or *defendeth* what you are *against*, unless my seasonable *Caveat* shall work your *Cure*. Consider how many of your *own Brotherhood* you have endeavour'd to expose to *shame* and *laughter*, before you censure those men who give you Examples of Moderation.

Who it is that abuseth the choicest of God's Servants.

Sect. 10. I know not well what you mean by *the choicest of God's servants*; it being become in these Times a most *equivocal Expression*. If you mean *King James* his *Puritans*, I have spent a whole Chapter for the Rectification of your mistake. If such as *truly serve God*, who have also writen *against Puritanes*, whereof I have given you a *specimen* in Bishop [illegible]rews, Doctor *Sanderson*, and other Episcopal Divines, you know that *These* are the men whom I am constantly *defending*. If God hath any choice servants in any sense, you are certainly the man who have writ against them: for you have written even with *bitterness* against your own *Saints*, as in your calmer moods you sometimes *call* them. But your Bitterness to the Bishops, and to the Regular Sons of the Church of *England*, and to all *persons* of *honour* in any part of the Land, who either partake of the *Common Prayer*, or attend to the *preaching* of the Episcopal Clergy, (I say) your Bitterness to *These* is so ineffably great, that mortal man cannot *express* it, but by repeating your own *Termes*. I should proceed to *shew* you your frightful *self*, from the *Ten last pages* of your *Grotian Religion*, but that I see you have *reprinted* the *substance* of them, in your Enormous *Preface* to your New Book of *Church Government and Worship*, which I intend to consider towards the end of my *Appendix*.

Sect. 11.

Made appear by an Example.

Sect. 11. It shall suffice in this place to put you in mind of your *Malignity* to a profound and pious Episcopal Divine, whose *Certificate* touching the *Primate* I was constrain'd to make *publick*. You call him a man of the *New Way*, (a *Grotian-papist* 'tis thought you *mean*.) You say he *blasted* a good business *by an unpeaceable writing*, and did not onely *foment a Schism*, but fomented it *by poor Insufficient Reasonings*, (p. 118.) Pretty words for a conclusion to your *Grotian Religion*. But such as will sufficiently put their speaker to *Rebuke*, as soon as your Readers shall be inform'd that your Bolt was shot at Mr. *Gunning*. For how can you hope to be *believ'd* when you shall let flie your Censures of *other* men, after the *liberty* you have taken to write so *grosly* of Mr. *Gunning*? The world will conclude you extremely *incontinent* of your Passion, when they shall find you throwing it out in three such *palpable Contradictions*, as that Mr. *Gunning* was the Author of an *unpeaceable writing*, that Mr. *Gunning* was guilty of *Fomenting a Schism*, and that any thing *poor* or *insufficient* fell from Mr. *Gunning*. Had you been honour'd with the Advantage of having *sate* for some years at his *learned Feet*, you had certainly attain'd a greater measure of Understanding, than to have mention'd his Writing with such *irreverence*.

Y AN

AN APPENDIX:

Conteining a *Rejoynder* to Diverse Things, both in *The Key for Catholicks*, and in The Book of *Disputations of Church-Government and worship*, &c.

WHilst I was drawing towards an End of what I thought fit to advertise you, concerning the principall Misadventures of your *Grotian Religion*, my Stationer sent me two bookes, at least as bitter, and as irrational, as the *worst* of that stuff which was laid before me. It seemes thy *silence* was *hurtfull* to you; And what I intended in my *Advertisment* (behind my *ἀντιπαρέρασις*) for nothing more than a *promise* that I would *Answer* you at *leisure*, with an addition of *Reasons* for my *Delay*, you fall upon with as much *confidence*, (and that in two Bookes at once,) as if you had *hope'd* that That *Promise* had been the onely *Performance* that I had meant you. So very *little* is my *Concernment* in what you Intitle a *Reply*, (wherein you *add* little or nothing to your *Grotian Religion*, how much soever you *borrow from it*,) That I might wel have *abstained* from giving you the Trouble of this *Appendix*,

The chief Occasion of this Appendix.

dix, by referring you to my *Answer*, as a sufficient *Rejoynder* to your *Reply*, but that I heare you are a *scorner*, and so unhappily inclinable to *flatter your self* with your *misfortunes*, as to think you are *fear'd*, when you are but *pitied*, and *passed by*. Some men must be dealt with, if not for *other* mens sakes, yet for their *owne*; if not because they *deserve* Resistance, yet because they may *want* it to check their *Pride*. It being pity (in my opinion) so to despise any mans *weaknesse*. as to make him dream he is *irresistible*.

The Patient's acknowledgment of his Disease.

Sect. 2. This is the chief consideration, by which I am moved to this Appendix; there being nothing more visible in your two last Bookes, than that you are *sick* of a shrewd Disease, which having *swell'd* up to your *Throat*, and broken out at your *mouth*, doth serve to justify the charge which was fram'd against you by Dr. *Owen*, without the Help of your own † *Acknowledgment*, that you are *proud and selfish*. Very faine would I follow my Inclinations, to treat you as gently in the *Conclusion*, as in the *Beginning* of my Book. And what incredible pleasure should I have taken in the present Discussion of Diverse Truths, had you but left me the *possibility* to be as respectfull towards *your self*, as you must acknowledg me to have been towards a Couple of your *Superiours*, (by name) D. *Reynolds*, and Dr *Bernard*? But so throughly have you *convinc'd* me, (by your * *two late* Volumes) of the irrefragable Orthodoxie and Truth of what you have put upon *Record* in another Place (to wit) † *That your Pride needs sharper Reprehensions then your friends have ever us'd about you*, (I do but *Echo* your *own words*,) that I must Cross my Inclinations, and change my stile for no other end, then to serve *your Needes*. For you give it me under your hand, both that your *Malady* is *dangerous*, and that it needs a *rough Cure*. You are not like Alexander's

† See your *Diss. of right to Sacram.* 5. p. 486. Where you also confess you are *Hypocritical*. Making bolder with your self, than I should ever have *allow'd* you by my consent.

* *Keyser Catholick* from p. 381 to p. 194. *Five Diss. of Church Gov. and Worship. Preface.* from p. 16. to p. 38.

† *Diss.* 5. *of Sacram.* p. 486.

andet's † *Bucephalus*, to be subdued with *sofinsage*. My *Brotherly Gentleness* (you * spake of) hath but *inrag'd* you; my *Moderation* (which you * acknowledged) hath made you *Fierce*; my *Charity towards you* (which you * applauded) hath accidentally Occasion'd your greatest *Hatred*. For (not to speak *yet* of your *innocent Railing*, which I may therefore call *Innocent*, because it is *too gross* to *hurt* me,) mark how desperately you *strike* both at my *Lively-hood* and my *Life*. And that with often-repeated *Blows*, even in Book upon Book.

† ἡ συγκαθίεν τὸ σῶμα πρὸς τὴν ἀνάβασιν. Diod. Sic. lib. ἱππικοῦ.

* Grot. Rel. Praef. Sect. 4.

* Ibid.

* Ibid.

Sect. 3. You do not onely say, in indefinite Termes, [† That *some of the New Party of Episcopall Divines are of Grotius his Religion, that is, Papists*,] Implying *me* to be one of Them in all that follow's; Nor do you content your self with saying, that we are *Papists, or Grotians*, (p.7.) *That we teach the Church of Rome to be the Mistress of other Churches*, (p.8.) *That we own Grotius his Popery* (p.32.) That we must *take heed how we continue Papists*, (p.33.) But Naming *me*, and *me onely*, (p.35.) you proceed to tell us, without Complement, *That we have gone far beyond such moderate Papists as Cassander, Hospitalius, Bodin, Thuanus, &c.* p.36. Nay speaking of *Grotius* his *Poperie*, you boldly add (even against your clearest *light* of *Knowledg*, and against your loudest *checks* of *Conscience*, if it is not *sear'd with an hot Iron*,) * That *I have defended this Religion, and that you have Rectors in England of this Religion, and that those that call themselves Episcopall Divines, and seduce unstudied partial Gentlemen, are crept into this Garb, and in this do all their parts happily*. Again you single me out by *Name*, and profess to † *see by many others, as well as by Mr.* P. *that the Design is still on foot: And that the Papists that are get so strong in England, under the mask of the Vani, the Seekers, the Infidels, the Quakers, the Behmenists, and many other Sells, have much addition to their strength by Grotians, that go under the mask of Episcopal Divines*. Nor does your Fury stop here: for, that your Readers may suppose me

An Instance of its malignity.

† *Praef. to disp. of Ch. Gov. and Wor.* p.6.7.8. 32.33.

* Key for Cath. p. 386.

† *Ibid.* p.39.

† Ibid. p. 390. 391. me one of the *worst sort of Papists*, you say that † *Grotius*, *called by Mr.* Pierce *a Protestant, did far out-got Them in Popery, whom the same man confesseth to have been Papists. He got's much further then Cassander : much further then Thuanus*, &c. Quite forgetting what you had said in another place, * *That though you Dissent much from Grotius his Pacification, yet are not your thoughts of Grotius, Cassander, Erasmus, Modrevius, Wicelius, or others of that strain, No Nor Thuanus, and many more moderate Papists, either bitter, Censorious, or uncharitable.* There you rank *Grotius* with *Cassander and Erasmus*, and imply *Thuanus* the greater Papist. But now forsooth he out-went them all. So in a fit of humanity, you said that † *Grotius design'd to reconcile both Parties in a Cassandrian Popery.* But now *it grieve's you that Grotius should far out-go the Cassandrian Papists, the remembrance of whose Wisdome, Moderation and Charity, is very gratefull to your Thoughts.* p. 390. I pray Sir, get you *a better Memory*, if you will not learn to speak *Truth*. But what is the *Design, which you see, by me and others is still on foot*, p. 391? * *Even a strong Design laid for the Introduction of Popery, and the five parts of the Plot* have taken such effect, as gives *it a strong probability of Prevailing, if God do not wonderfully blast it.*

* Grot. Religion p. 9.

† Christian Conc. p. 45.

* Ibid. p. 46.

In four respects.

Sect. 4. Thus you make me not onely a kind of *Seminary Priest*, but one who hath *counterfeited the Protestant* in such a Dangerous Degree, as to have gotten into a *Rectory* where I have daily opportunities to serve the *Pope*; and so by consequence being discover'd by the subtil Endeavours of Mr. *Baxter*, I am lyable to die a most *shameful Death*. An Imputation the more hainous in these following respects.

First, because you had a *warning* in my 'Ραψοδιμαρτυρία, not to * *slander* any man Living, much lesse a Man whom you must reckon to be ** *your own Mothers son*, if you pretend to be a *son* of the *Church of Engl.* much less with a plot to bring in *Popery*, rather than *Judaisme*, or *Witchcraft*, or whatever else is most *absurd*. For though I earnestly pray for the peace of Christendom, and think as well of the *Papists*,

** Ps. 50. 20.

Papists, as an unpassionate Protestant may be allowed, yet do I abhor being a *Papist*, as much as being a *Presbyterian*; and will as soon be a *Turk*, as I will be either. Compare my *premonition* before the book above-mention'd, with the *beginning* of the *first* Chapter, and with the *middle* of the *third*, that you may see the *aggravations* of your offence.

Next, because it is a *groundless*, and so by consequence a *spiteful, inhuman charge*. For where have I ever *defended Popery*? Or when did I write *one word* for *Grotianism*, as you expound it by † *Popery*? Or where did I ever use the *word*? Name the *booke*, and the *page*, and the *numerical lines* which I have written, if I have written any such thing. Are you an *Answerer of Books*, whilst you *forge*, and *falsifie*, and declaim at random against your *Dreams*, to which you entitle your *Brother's Name*, without directing your Readers to any one *page*, or *expression*, whereby to give some *colour* to your Inventions? What *unstudied Gentleman have I seduced*? or where are the *footsteps* which I have *trodden*, towards the management of a *plot* to bring in *Popery*? for shame do somwhat like a *Man*, (if not at all like a *Christian*) either to *prove* I am a *Papist*, or to make me at least some *Reparations*, in as *publick* a manner as you have wrong'd me. pag. 381.

Thirdly, because your *Accusation* could not but flie into your Face, and significantly call you a *false-Accuser*. For you know it never was my profession, that I was of *Grotius his Religion*, (let his Religion have been what it would) but rather that *Grotius* was of *mine*, by being a *Protestant* and a *Peacemaker*. If I was *mistaken* in my opinion, you should have gather'd from thence, *that I am fallible*; not at all, that *I am a Papist*; because a man may be a *Protestant*, and yet be *mistaken* in his opinion. You are a wilful Deviator from the Thing under Dispute, and shall be made to *acknowledge* that you are such. For it is not our Question, *whether Grotian Popery is Good*; but, *whether Grotius* (good man) was indeed a *Papist*. Had I *affirm'd* the *former*, I might have been liable to your charge; but

you

you know I onely *denyed the latter*; and cannot conceive any such thing as *Grotian Popery*, more then any such thing as *Baxterian Paganism*. For though you † *favour* the *Pagans*, yet doth it not follow that you are *one*. Even *Luther*, and *Zuinglius*, and I think *Parens*, do hope for Salvation for diverse Pagans, although the two latter were *Presbyterians*. You are not so thick of understanding, as not to be able to distinguish between a *matter of Fact*, and a *matter of Faith*. From whence it follow's that you are *wilful*, and speak in *despight* to your understanding, when, the Question being put [*whether* Grotius *de Facto turn'd Papist, or not*] you tell the world I am a *Papist* because I think that *he* was *none*. There may be men of *both* parties of *both* opinions in point of *Fact*, whilst yet they retain their Parties too. Nay the Question may be put to a *Mahumetan, or a Jew*, who retaining their *own* Religions may judge impartially of a *Christian*, whether they think he either *changed*, or changed *not* his Religion, for that of the *Jews*, or the *Mahumetans*. It was lately a Question twixt Dr. *Bernard* and my self, whether the Primate of *Armagh* had chang'd his Judgment: wherein though *He* was of one mind, and I of another, yet I did not infer, that *He* was a *Calvinist*, nor *He*, that I was an *Arminian*. The Question being not put concerning what we *approve*, but concerning the *Truth* of the thing done. So in the Case of *Grotius*, it is not disputed by *you*, and *me*, whether *Grotius* did *well* in *turning Papist*, (for if he turn'd Papist, we *both condemn* him,) but whether he actually *did*, or *did not* turn Papist. And to say he *did*, when he did *not*, is not to *oppose*, but to *make* a Papist. He * *affirm'd* that he *did not*, and I *believe* his affirmation. But it is not *Popery*, to take a man upon his word; if it is, you are a *Papist* for the very same reason: for certainly there are Papists, whom you *believe* when they *tell* you that they are Papists. Behold the Case in another Colour. The *Jansenians* do profess to *detest* the severall propositions, which were condemned by *Pope Innocent*: but † *approving* the Pope's *Sentence*, they deny the *Fact*, to wit that *Jansenius* affirm'd the *Contrary*: (where by the way let

† *Saints Rest. Edit.* 2. *part* 1. *p.* 155, 156.

* look back on *ch.* 1. *p.* 11. *Arg.* 1.

† Consulatur *Mysterium Jesuit.*

let it be noted, that either *Austin* and *Jansenius* are of the Judgment that I am for, Or their greatest friends and Abettors are no less Oppugners of the Calvinists than the *Molinists* themselves;) will you say they *love* what they *detest*, because they deny that *Jansenius* said it? you will be hooted at, if you do, as a very *strange Creature*. And yet you have done as absur'd a thing. For I am as different from a Papist, as any Protestant can be of the Church of England. Yet because I deny that *Grotius turn'd Papist*, you make no scruple, to call me Papist for my reward. A Calumny savouring of as much weakness, as if St. *Basil* should have pronounced *Athanasius* himself to have turned *Arian*, for conceiving all to be *Orthodox* in *Dionysius* his Writings (of *Alexandria*,) in which, St. *Basil* was of opinion, that something of *Arianism* was couched.

Fourthly, your Accusation is the more hainous, because it reacheth to the *Dishonourning* of the *Ablest Protestants* in the world, who *deny* that Grotius turn'd Papist, as well as I. In particular *Doctor Hammond* must needes be One of your *Grotian Papists*, for having vindicated *Grotius* from the charge of *Popery*, although he hath written *against* the *Papists*, (O how infinitely better than you have done! and) to much better purpose, than *all* the men of *your way*. Another of your Papists is Mr. *Thorndike*, whose Learned book against *Popery* and *Puritanism* together, I pray be sure to *understand*, before you *Answer*. Nay *Arnoldus Poelenburg* the *Presbyterian* (but one of the learnedst of that way, as being a Follower of *Arminius*, and not of *Calvin*,) must pass with *you* for a *Papist*, (as *you* with your *fellow* * *Presbyterians*,) because he hath lately made it appeare, that *Grotius* dyed a *true Protestant*. I shall give you his words in their proper Place.

* Note once for all, that I call you *Presbyterian*, onely *ἐυτυχῶς*.

Sect. 5. Having discover'd to you the *guilt*, I now proceed to acquaint you with the *unskilfullness* of your Crime. Mr. *Crandon* you call a *Judicious Padagogue*, from whence I conclude, that he *Teacheth School*. He was one of those Brethren, who *told the world you are a Papist and one of the worst sort of Papists, and what the* (particular) *Bookes*

Mr. *Grandon's Advantage.*

* *Disp. of Sacram.* 5. p. 486.

were which had made you a Papist, and what Emissaries you have in all parts of the Land. Now observe the Rod which you have made; and the severall Twiggs of correction out of which it is compos'd; and how you have put this Rod into the hands of Mr. Crandon; who being a Padagogue, know's how to lay it on, especially when he finds you so bare and naked. Do not kick at the Expression. For you have told us your needes, and what it is that must do you good. Too much respect it seeme's destroys you. And though it is crosse to my Inclinations, yet I can put on Severity for an hower or two, when I think it may tend to so good a purpose, as to make you for ever cast off your Railing.

The Accuser of Protestants proved a Papist by 24. Arguments, according to his own logick.

In the Person of Mr. Crandon, and by the force of your Logick against your self, It will be ease to prove you an arrant Papist in a Disguize. For 1. We have your Confession, that some of the Brotherhood it self have publickly laid it to your charge, who being judicious and godly men, would never have accus'd you of such a Crime, if they had dot had Grounds and Reasons for it. 2. You have not hetherto clear'd your self, as you would certainly have done, if you had been able. For though you have writ against the Papists a great deal more then enough, yet that is no more then a Blindation to escape the rigor of the Law. How could you hold a Sequestration, if you did not act the Presbyterian? Dr. Taylor writ against Papists, and yet you know what you have * call'd him. Dr. Hammond and Mr. Thorndike have writ against Papists, But you know what they are for defending Grotius. Archbishop Laud writ against them in an unanswerable manner, And yet you know how you have slurr'd him for having † befriended the Grotian Plot. Nay 3. Your Bookes against Popery become an Argument to prove you its greatest Friend; Because they are Arm'd with so much weakness, as is a treacherous strength against the Protestant Cause. Some are hired to resist, that they may certainly be beaten, and led in Triumph. We who know how Caligula did hire the Gaules, can guesse at the use of your Keys for Catholicks. Had you in-

* Disp. with Mr. Tombes Pa. 327.

† Praef. to Grot. Rel. Sect. 25.

intended them any *Hurt*, you would have left them to the rigor of *Abler Pens*. For you were told by Dr. *Sanderson*, That the *sufficient Disputants* with the *Papists* are the *Episcopall Divines*. 4. You have *vilified* the *Protestants* of every Sect and Division, and the *best* in the *greatest* measure. Neither *Bolsee* nor *Fevardentius* have gone beyond you. † You have declared in point of Discipline, against the *Episcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, and *Erastian*, as not the *Scriptural way*, not the *way of Christ*. And if all *Protestants* are reducible to those 4. *Heads*, (as sure they are,) then 'tis clear that you write against *all the Protestants*, and make men run into *Popery* by way of *Refuge*. Or if you fright them also from thence, by your *winding-sheet*, or your *Key*, you leave them to be nothing but *Jewes*, and *Heathens*. And I would very fain know, what sort of *Christians in all the world*, you have not endeavour'd to *Disgrace*, at one time, or another, either in *earnest*, or in *jest*. I do seriously profess, I can think of *none*. 5. You do exceedingly *commend* the very *same* sort of *Papists*, and with the *same* kind of Praises which *Grotius* give's them. You say,* [*when you read their publick writings, you think they are now Blessed Soules with Christ. You read them with a great deal of Love and honour to the writers. The French moderation is acceptable to all good men: That Nation is an honourable part of the Church of Christ in your Esteem. Much more must you honour the Pacificatory Endeavours of any that attempt the healing of the Church.*] Can you blame Mr. *Crandon*, or any *reall Presbyterian*, for thinking or saying you are a Papist, when they *read* such stuffe and *compare* it with what you say against *Grotius*? will they not *shrug*, or *shake* their *heads*, with a *Totus Mundus exercet Histrioniam*? 6. Why should you labor to deceive the vulgar people into a Belief, that the *ablest Protestants* in the land are *Grotian Papists*, (in the number of which, I am far from reckoning my self,) unless it were to this end, that the simple ones may *flye* from such as are *Protestants indeed*, and shelter themselves under the *Papists* for feare of *Popery*? I mean the *Papists* who march about, eject the *Protestants*, and suc-

* *Praef. Sect.* 17.

† *Look back as Ch.* 1. *Sect.* 11.

* *Grot. Rel.* p. 10.

succeed them, as well in the *profits* of their *Places*, as in the priviledge of their Pulpits, under the *Title* and *Maske* of *Presbyterians*. So very fitly was it said by our Learned and Reverend * Dr. *Sanderson*, That your Party have been the great *Promoters of the Roman Interest among us*, that *you have hardened the Papists, and betrayed the Protestant Cause*.

* See his *Unanswerable Preface to the second Edition of his first Sermons.*

7. You refuse to joyne with *us Protestants* in the *Publick Liturgy* of the Church, and to Communicate with us in the Sacrament of Eucharist according to the prescription of *Lawes* and *Canons*; which doth the rather become an Argument of your being turn'd *Papist*, Because in all such statutes as have been made (since the first year of *Queen Elizabeth*) *against Popish Recusants*, The refusing to be *present at Common-Prayer, or to receive the Sacrament according to the Formes and Rights mentioned in that Book*, is expressed as the most proper legal Character, whereby to distinguish a *Popish Recusant* from a *true Protestant*. In so much that *Use* hath been made of that very Character in sundry Acts, since the beginning of the long Parliament, for the taxing of double Payments upon Recusants. Which very Argument was used by † the *University of Oxford*, against the *Ordinance for the Directory* imposed on them.

† *Reasons of the present Judgment, &c. p. 34.*

8. In that you profess your self a *Protestant*, and yet declare against all four waies, (*Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent*, and *Erastian*,) giving out that the *way of Christ* must be compounded of all fower, you help to *justifie the Papists* in the reproaches which they cast upon our Religion, *That we know not what our Religion is; That since we left them, we know not where to stay; and that our Religion is a* * *Parliamentary Religion*. Would you have done them so great a *service*, if you had not been of *their side?* A likely matter.

Ib. p. 5.

* *Harding confut. of Apology part 6. ch. 2.*

9. Your not allowing the Civil Magistrate to be *Supreme in all Causes*, as well *Ecclesiastical*, as *Civil*, doth very clearly discover your partialitie to *A Pope*. The *Oath of Supremacy* here in *England* was purposely framed for such as *You*.

10. It was observed by Bishop *Bramhall* against * *Militiere*, that the private whispers, and printed insinuations of *Papists*, touching the Church of *England's* coming about

* *p. 451*

to

to shake hands with the *Roman* in the points controverted, was merely devised to gull some silly Creatures, whom they found too apt to be caught with chaff. And That *Art* which was us'd to *begin* our *Breach*, you have craftily *continued* to make it wider. For *intus existens prohibet Alienum*, whilst the *Episcopal Protestants* are kept from being cast out, the Roman Religion can never enter. 11. You are a *Papist* as much as *Grotius*, though you should prove as much a *Protestant* as *Grotius* was. But you do every where contend that *Grotius* was a Papist; and so (at least in that Notion) you must needs be a Papist as well as *He*. 12. You† profess to *approve of pacificatory Attempts between us and the Papists; and that you are zealously desirous of it*; and that *you honour the peaceable Dispositions of the late Episcopal Divines*. Which being duly compar'd with all you say *against Grotius*, and *against* the late *Episcopal Divines*, and this again being compar'd with what you have written both *for*, and *against* the *Directory*, as well as *for*, and *against* the *Common-prayer*, and *against* the very Covenant which you pretended to be *for*, and *for* Episcopacy it self which yet you Covenanted *against*, may lay a ground of *Suspicion* that you have gotten a *Dispensation*, to use your *Tongue* and your *pen* as you see occasion: you having been both *for*, and *against* the Papists, as well as *for*, and *against* the Presbyterians. 13. Whilst you labour to prove that *Grotius* turn'd Papist, you are doing the Papists a special service, by robbing our Churches of such a *prop*, and by tempting as many to turn Papists, as do believe that *Grotius* knew what was *best*. Whereas the *true Protestants* (on the contrary) are encouraged to *adhere* to the Church of *England* (however disgraced and forsaken by a revolting people) by the *Judgment* of *Grotius* that she was neerest unto the *Primitive*, in point of *purity*, and *pious Order*. 14. The Design which is laid by you and others for the Introduction of Poperie, is driven on by those means which you have * acknowledged your self to be proper and suitable to the work, notwithstanding you have *hid* them with other Names. The first part of the *plot* is, *to blow up the sparkes of*

† *Grot. Relig.* p. 30. p. 20. p. 21.

* See your *Christian Concord.* p. 46, 47.

of Schism and Heresie, that our Church being divided may become odious, and men be prepared for a Remove. The second is, *An Incessant Indeavour to infect all persons, especially those in power, Civil or Miliary, with the opinion of Libertinism*, (for which look back on Chap. 3.) that so your Doctrines and Practises may have vent, and exercise. Your third plot is, *to get down the learned, judicious, Godly, painful Ministers*, (such as by name I lately mentioned Chap. 6. Sect. 9.) *at least to take away their publick Maintenance*; that the people may take such Ministers as will humour them most, and do their work best cheap. The fourth part of the plot is, *to hinder the Union of other Protestants with Episcopal Divines, and the regular exercising of Discipline, or maintaining of Church-Order*; that the Papists may say we have no Church, no Government, &c. and that by division we may be disabled from opposing them. The fifth part of it is, *to keep afoot a party of learned Men, who under the Name of Presbyterians may keep an Interest in the people, and partly draw them from Unity, and from obeying their Superiours by pretending a Necessity to abolish Episcopacy and Presbytery, and to set up Presbytery in its stead*, or somewhat else without a Name, expressed at random by *The Scepter and Way of Christ*, thereby to *widen our Breaches, and so prepare a way for Popery*.

The Bishop of Canterbury cleared from his Accuser, & his Accuser from himself.

Thus you see how exactly your *Satyrs* fit you, which you have fram'd against the *soundest* of all the *Protestants* in the world, whom you will needs (because you *will*) call *Grotian Papists*. If you *deny* your being a Papist, we are not bound to believe you, in case we believe you when you avow the having * *Hypocrisie in your heart*. When you *proclaim* your self an *Hypocrite*, (for so you did from the Press, or I had not read it) you cannot blame me for my *Belief*. For either your proclamation was *true*, or *false*: if *true*, you are an *Hypocrite*, because you say it in *sincerity*: if *false*, you are an *Hypocrite*, because you are *not* when you say you *are*. Besides, you were not angry with Dr. *Owen*, although he told *you* of your *Hypocrisie*, a little *before* you told *him*; much less may your Anger break out on *me*, for

* *Disp. 5. of Sacr. p. 484.*

for having onely *believed* what you have *told* me. Adde one thing more. The *Bishop* of *Canterbury protested before God and his holy Angels*, and that upon the fatal *Scaffold*, even immediately before he laid his *Neck* upon the *Block*, that he had never any hand in any *Design* whatsoever to *bring in Popery*, or to *alter the Religion by Law established*. He never told *you* of any *Hypocrisie in his heart*, much less at the *Instant* of his *Departure*, yet how have *you* and Mr. *Hickman* done your worst to *defile* his spotless memorie? And if you cannot believe *Him*, nay if you cannot believe *me*, when I profess to be a *Son* of the Protestant Church here in *England*, attested to by the Blood of our English *Martyrs*, (who were *Prelates*, and *Prelatists*, not Presbyterians,) How can you hope to find credit, whilst you profess what I have done? Yet in conclusion I must tell you, I do not believe you are a Papist, how much soever some of your Brethren have charg'd you with it. I have onely spoken in this Section by a *Prosopopœia*, to shew you the follie of your reasonings whilst you dispute against *Grotius*, and call *us Papists* who think him *None*.

Sect. 6. Now to the Testimonie you * bring from *Claud. Sarravius*, I oppose a better Testimonie from *Arnoldus Poelenburgius*, a learned Protestant of the Low Countries in the *North-part of Holland*, a person acquainted with *Grotius* his *Wife* and *Children*, and one who dedicates his Book to *William Grotius*, an Eminent *Lawyer* now in *Holland*, made much more eminent by being *Brother* to *Hugo Grotius*. *Arnoldus Poelenburg* having premised how great a Man in all points this *Hugo* was; *(So great, that This Age hath not brought forth a greater,) His wonderful knowledge in the Law, His unfathomable Depth in the Things of God, His exact Command of all story both ancient and modern, as well sacred as secular, His Incredible evolution of Books for number not to be reckond, His stupendious Comprehension of all the languages in the world, by which a person of his Importance might be advantaged or adorn'd, His poetical Supereminence, His Elocution not to be equalled, His weight of matter*

Grotius *his second vindication:*

* *Disp. of Ch. gov. and wor. Pref. p. 31.*

ter and blessed stile, His singular Temperance, and Modesty, and other vertues, His being persecuted at home for sticking to God and a good Conscience, His being sued to from abroad by Kings and Princes and principal persons of the world, and last of all His being envied for his unimitable performances by such as thought him too happy for one single Man as yet in vità; I say, *Arnoldus Poelenburg* having premised *a page or two* to this purpose, proceeds to vindicate his Memorie from the Aspersion under Debate.

Arnol. Poelenb. Pastoris Ecclesiæ Remon. Hornanæ in Epist. præf. Dissertationi Epistolicæ. p. 13, 14.

Ad *Papismi criminationem* facilis est Responsio. Nam sicut is, qui duobus viris de possessionum Terminis inter se litigantibus Arbitrum se offert, vix alterutrius odium effugit, quia uterque sibi plurimum vindicat, & quisque suspicatur sibi minus attributum quàm Justitia flagitabat; Ita qui partes in Religionis Negotio dissidentes componere satagit, vix poterit, quin ab alterâ parte pro hoste habeatur, quia in diversæ partis homines liberalior fuisse visus est. *D. Grotium* autem *nobis ad extremum usq; addictum* fuisse satis *liquet* ex illo *posthumo scripto*, cui maximè *Adversarij* ejus *infensi* sunt. Ibi enim *D. Utenbogardi* aliorumquè Antistitum nostrorum non sine laudis Elogio meminit. Præterea *Uxor Ipsius, Honestissima Matrona*, cùm post fata Mariti ex illo glorioso non minus quàm diuturno exilio *Hagam Comitis* reversa sedem Domicilii ibi collocaret, statim *illa se nostræ Ecclesiæ adjunxit, sacram synaxin nobiscum celebravit*; denique *affirmavit Maritum suum, neque in Galliis UNQUAM, neq; extra Gallias alicubi Templum Pontificiorum frequentasse, aut eorum sacris interfuisse. Puto hoc Argumenti satis esse, quod Defectionem ad Pontificios meditatus non fuerit*; Quod nonnulli aut *Malevoli* homines, aut certè *nimium suspicaces* opinantur.

His Wife his Witness.

Here is a witness beyond exception, even the *Friend of his* † *Bosom*, a very *honourable Matron* in herself, and therefore fit to be believed, although she had been but a common *Friend*; whereas we know she was *more* than a common *Wife*; for she *contriv'd his safety* with the *utmost* hazard of *her own*. She was * *The Saviour of the Body*, in the

† Deut. 13. 6.

* Σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος

Eph. 5. 23. Quia uxoris salus à viro dependet, sicut Ecclesiæ salus est à Christo. *Beza in locum.*

words

words and sense of the Apostle Concerning *Husbands*. An *Individual* Partner and Companion in all his *Sufferings*. One who endeared him to Herself, by her so many great effects of her *Love* and *Loyalty*, (which have made her a *pattern* to other women, and hereafter will make her a *proverb* too,) that he could not conceal his *Religion* from Her, whom he had worthily seated so near his *Heart*. What need we more in so clear a Case? The *Wife* of *Grotius* was both a *Protestant herself*, (as well at her residence in *Paris*, as at her return unto the *Hague*) and hath constantly † affirmed (to all desirous of Information) that her Husband and herself were *never divided* in their *Religion*. That he did never * *at any time*, † in *any part of the world*, so much as permit himself to be * *present at any papistical Devotions*. Never was there a Wife of greate *Wisdom* and *Gravity*, and *Christian courage*, in the esteem of an Husband, than *she* in *his*. Never was there a Husband, who left behind him a greater Monument of *honour* & *gratitude* to a wife. And could he (think you) be a *Papist* without *her* Knowledge? Or could he (think you) *turn Papist* without his *own*? He made profession to *Laurentius*, who writ the *Grotius Papizans*, (which you are now so unskilfull as to object,) that he was *not turn'd Papist*, as had been slanderously reported, which having told you of already (*ch.*1.*p.*11,12.) I will incourage you to *believe* whatsoever his *Wife* hath affirmed of him, by letting you see how much he *prized* her.

† Look back on *ch.*1. *Sect.*5. *p.*12,13.

* † Neque *in* Galliis *usquam*, neque *extra* Gallias *alicubi*, &c.

* Aut eorum sacris *Interfuisse*.

**** Nos quoque, si quisquam, multum debere fatemur*
Conjugio. Memini, post tot tua vota precesque,
Cynthia cùm nonum Capto mihi volveret orbem,
Qualem te primum, Conjux fidissima, vidi
Carteris in Tenebris: Lachrymas absorpserat Ingens
Vis Animi, neque vel gemitu Te Luctus adegit
Consentire malis. Rursus nova vincula, sed quæ
Te Socia leviora tuli, dum milite clausos
Nos Mosa & tristis Vahalis circumstrepit undâ.
Heic Patriam toties & inania jura vocanti
Et proculcatas in nostro corpore leges,

Sylva Grotiana [illegible] *ad Augusti Thuani Francisci Filium* p.5,6.

Tu solamen eras. Heic jam Te viderat alter
Et post se media plus parte reliquerat Annus,
Cum mihi jura mei per Te solerte reperto
Reddita. Tu, postquam jam cœta acceperat Alvus
Dulce onus, oppositis libabas oscula claustris:
Atq; ita semoto foribus custode locuta es.
Summe Pater, rigido si non Adamante futurum
Stat tibi, sed precibus potis es gaudesque moveri,
Hoc quod nostra Fides lucem servavit in istam
Accipe Depositum, tantisque exolve periclis.
Conjugii testor Sanctissima jura, meaque
Spem sobolis, Non huc venio pertæsa malorum,
Sed miserata virum: possum sine Conjuge, possum
Quamvis dura pati. Si post exempla ferocis
Ultima sævitiæ nondum deferbuit ira,
In me tota ruat: vivam crudele sepulchrum
Me premat, & triplicis cingat custodia Valli,
Dum meus ætheria satietur pastibus Aura
Grotius, & Casus narret Patriæque suosque.
Dixerat, atque oculis fugientia vela secutis
Addit; Abi Conjux, neque Te nisi Libera cernam,
Quod mea si anderet Famam spondere Camena,
Acciperet quantis virtutem laudibus istam
Posteritas? ———

A Rejoynder to as much of the Key for Catholicks as pretends to be a Reply to my old Advertisement.

Sect. 7. I now pass on (as you direct me) to the *latter part* of your *Key for Catholicks*, of which your Pen hath made great Boast. But every man's *cause* is not the *best*, who hath the *fondest opinion* of his performance. For then there were no disputing with you. You would be constantly in the *right*, which part soever you undertook. You say, *the Business of Grotius is it, upon which you are to meddle with me.* p. 382. And first you promise me to *yield* (what I told you) *That for the very same reasons, upon which you conclude that Grotius is a Papist, you must also conclude him to be a Protestant, unless you think as hardly of the Augustan Confession, as you seem to do of the Councill of Trent*; But you will not *perform* it till the Greek Calends. For you condition

condition with me to prove, *That a Protestant is one who holdeth to the Council of Trent, &c.* And are you fitted to be a *Disputant*, whose *strength* is onely to be *stwrdy* in a meer *begging of the Question*? welfare the *Down-right* Dr. *Kendal* for faithfully telling you in his Book, That *A little more of the University would have done you no harm.* See and wonder at your unhappiness, (which was *Rivet's* as well as *yours.*) You objected against *Grotius*, his having *set out* the Canons of the *Trent Council* in his Conciliatory Design. To which I answered, that he did equally *set out* the Articles of the *Protestant Council* at *Augusta.* So as if *that* doth prove him a *Papist*, *This* must prove him also a *Protestant.* Whereas indeed they *both* prove him a *Reconciler.* You confess it is not *Popery* to be a *Peace-maker*; Nay you pretend at least to be one your self. You often *wish* for peace and union between *us* and the *Papists*; But how can Peace be ever made betwixt two *Adversary parties*, without a mutuall *Collation* of both their *Doctrines*? which if they are thought *so* to differ, as to be quite *irreconcilable*, who would *labour* to reconcile them? When * *Grotius* told *Rivet*, that he had put forth the *Doctrines*, as well of the *Augustan*, as the *Tridentine* Council, because he believed they *differed less* than many others did apprehend, he conceived the *Papists* Doctrines might be made to conforme unto the *Protestants*, not the *Protestants* unto the *Papists*, (meaning not the Presbyterian, but *sober* Protestants, such as those at *Augusta*, remember That,) for in the very *same page* (as in twenty others which I have met with) He pleads for the *Reforming* of *Popish Errors*, (whether the *Pope* will or no) by *Kings and Bishops within* their *Bounds.* But never yet could I find, that he acknowledg'd the *least Error*, in either the Discipline or Doctrine of *sober Protestants*; such as the Followers of *Melanchthon*, and the *unchangeable* Sons of the *Church* of *England.* The words of *Grotius*, which have *open'd* shall *stop* your mouth: *Licuerit sanè Regibus, & legitimè constitutis Episcopis, intra suos fines quædam corrigere, quæ videbantur corrigenda.* There he approves of the *Reformations* in the Dukedom of *Saxonie*, and here

* At *Grotius* non eam Bullam —— solam edidit, sed & confessionem Augustanam, existimans, commodè acceptas Doctrinas Tridentinam & Augustanam inter se non ita pugnare, ut multi credidere. *Discuss. p. 7.*

Ibid.

Ibid. p. 8. here in *England*. *At quo jure privati, ubi Ecclesiæ erant, Novas constituerunt Ecclesias, nullis ab Episcopis ortas, nullis cum Episcopis cohærentes?* There he condemns the Reformations *(so called)* which were made by the *Scotish*, and *other* rebellious *Presbyterians*.

To beg the Question must not pass for a Reply.

Sect. 8. To the next part of your Reply *(p.* 383.*)* I easily give you this full Return. 1. You do not so much as *pretend* a *proof*, that you did not *mistake* the *drift* of the most excellent *Discussio*; but poorly aske, *if his words are not plain enough*; and *bid the Readers of his words become the Judges*, Thus you are still an *arrant Beggar* of the *Question*; and as to the duty of a *Replicant*, a meer *Tergiversator*. Any *child* might have said the *first*; and why do you write so many books, if you quit your self manfully in the *second*? In stead of all your Disputes, you might have appealed once for all to your partial Readers; but then you must not pretend to give any *Answer*, or *Replies*. You aske if *Grotius his words are not plain enough*; thereby implying that they *are*, when yet you *prove* they are *not*; for I have shew'd, and shall shew you your *gross mistakes*. I am ever as ready, as you can be, to submit my *Cause* to the indifferent Reader; but I suppose it my duty to *plead* it first. Indeed to *Poelenburg* and Mr. *Thorndike*, and so *unerring* a person as Dr. *Hammond*, the words of *Grotius* are plain enough. Plain enough to let them see that *Grotius* was but a *peacemaker*, not a *Papist*: And it seems they are *plain* even to *me*, because I see the *same* thing. But even for that very reason they cannot be *plain enough* to *you*, Sir, because you seem to see from them that their Authour *was*, what he was *not*. The printed Judgments of those *three* above mention'd, are directly *contrary* to *yours*. Whether *They*, or *you*, are best able to interpret the *Words* of *Grotius*, I may very well say, *Let the Reader judge*. The *learnedest* persons in all the world (not *only* the learnedest, but the *most* too) as well of the *Romish* as of the *Protestant* Church, do judge of his *Words*, and his *Religion*, as I have shew'd you. And could you content your self to say, (when you could say nothing better)

better) —*Are not his words plain enough, and frequent enough to open to us so much of his mind as I have charged him with?* It is but answering, *No*, and then where are you? I beg your pardon for my prolixity, when such a *Syllable* would have *sufficed*.

2. You craftily *omit* the chiefest part of my charge; which was that you did either *not translate* your Citations, or that you did it so *lamely*, * *as to conceal the true meaning from English Readers*. You translate *so much*, as might make him *seem* to be a *Papist*, but you *forbeared* the translating of what would have proved him to be *None*. Which was (to use King *James* his instance) as if an Atheist should cite those words out of the Psalmist, *There is no God*, concealing the words going before, *The fool hath said in his Heart*. Had you translated either *all*, or *none*, or as *much* as had cleared the *Authors meaning* in the whole, you had not met with a reprehension. And therefore you wrong your self extremely, by saying *you purposely omitted to translate the words of Grotius, foredeeming that such men as I would have said they were mistranslated*, (p. 383.) For you did frequently translate them, but you did it with *partiality*, as hath been † shew'd. And so you speak against your *knowledge* in a *publick* matter of *Fact*. Having printed your *doings*, you now deny the things *done*; as it were lifting up your *right* hand *against* your *left*. If you *foredeemed* as you pretend, why did you dare to translate a *little*? if not, why would you *say* it? and why did you not translate a little *more*? *Happy is the man who condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.*

* Note that the *later* words are those, of which I taxe you for the *omission*.

† See my *Advertisement p. penult.* and compare it with *both* your books.

3. Now *at last* indeed you translate *his wish*, *that the Divulsion which fell out and the Causes of the divulsion might be taken away*. *The primacy of the Bishop of* Rome *according to the Canons is none of these, as* Melanchthon *confesseth*, p. 383. But you conceal his next words, which make for *his* and *my* advantage, to wit, *The opinion of* Melanchthon, *That the Bishop of* Rome's *primacy is also* * *necessary to the retaining of unity*. Which opinion, if it made not *Melanchthon* a Papist in your accompt, (no not our own Bp. *Bramhal* who

* Qui (*Melanchthon*) eum primatum etiam *necessarium* putat ad retinendam unitatem. *Discuss. p. 256.*

who yet is one of your *late Prelates*) why should not *Grotius* have been a *Protestant*, the Melanchthonian opinion notwithstanding? Did you think that *Primacy* and *Supremacy* were ἐπίθετα, two words for one thing? That Primacy of *Order* in the Church, is the same for substance, with Supremacy of *Power over* the Church? learn to think so *no more* from this day-forward. The Primacy yielded unto the Bishop of *Rome*, is in respect of *Order*, not at all of *Jurisdiction*; and that in *Grotius* his *sense*, as his next words teach you. † *Neque enim hoc est, Ecclesiam subjicere Pontificis libidini, sed reponere Ordinem sapienter institutum.* Which shew's the error of your Confidence in your Grotian Religion, p. 35.

† Ibid.

Sect. 9. Whereas you say, *you supposed that all you wrote this for understood latin* (p. 384.) You do imply your self faulty for putting *part* of it in *English*, unless you thought us unable to understand the *whole*. But you confidently add, *you translated none of the sentence*, (ibid.) although you translated *a part* of it, no less than *twice in one page*. And though *you thought it no Injury to give accompt in english but of part*, yet I have shew'd it *was* an Injury, and told you *why*. If I did not translate what I recited out of Grotius to my Advantage, you should have *thank'd* me for such a favour, as the advancing *your* Interest by the neglecting of mine *own*. But if you look on my *Advertisement*, (as I have done at your appointment) you will find me complaining of your *silence, as to the Causes of the Breach, which Grotius did wish might be taken away*. I had no doubt translated *more*, but for the hastiness of the Carrier, which did not allow me so great Advantage. I meant by your *silence*, your not acquainting your English Readers with that which serv'd to *clear* Grotius, but onely with that which you thought *against* him. The *Negation of Causes*, viz. that of the *Primacy of the Bishop of Rome*, cannot suffice for your task to prove *Grotius a Papist*, because for *that*, he cites *Melanchthon*. Nor doth the *Primacy* signify *the universall Headship*, (as you do *wilfully* aver, or very *weakly*, p. 384.) because of the reasons so lately rendred.

Sect.

Sect. 10. You confess *that Grotius doth charge the Papists with the Causes of the Divulsions*, (*p.*385.) But you add, that he chargeth *the Protestants much more.* You must *distinguish* of Protestants, as I have told you over and over. The *true and regular* Reformers he never chargeth, but onely the *subverters of Church and State*, who us'd the *Title* for a *pretense*. As our Saviour charged the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, not with *pouring out prayers*, (as if to *pray* were a sin) but with using them as a *cloak*, (as some have us'd the word * *Liberty for an occasion to the flesh*) to cover their † *devouring of widow's Houses*. If he charged the *Papists*, but not with *Popery*, (the second part of your evasion) why doth he frequently complain of the *lust* and *Tyranny* of the *Pope*, and the Corruptions of the Papists in point of *Doctrine*, as well as *manners*? exhorting *Princes* and *Bishops*, if the Pope will not joyn, to *reform without him*?

* *Gal.*5.13.

† *Mat.*23.14.

Sect. 11. You say *the things were but two, which Grotius found faulty in the Papists*, (*Vot. pro Pace.p.*7.8.) And those you lamely represent too, *p.*385. Read again, and you will find them to be *Three*: for *first* he saith, that *by the Schoolmen, many opinions were introduced, and that from a liberty of arguing, not at all from the Authority of General Councils* (Mark the Councils which he was for.) 2. That *the opinions established by the Councils were by those very Schoolmen incommodiously expounded.* (These are two distinct things, to *forge New* Doctrins and to *misinterpret the old ones*, which you have *confounded* in your Recital.) 3. That *Pride* and *Avarice* and *manners of ill example had prevailed in such a measure among the Governors of the Church*, (of which remember the *Pope* was *chief*) *that they were neither sollicitous, as they ought, to press upon the people those wholsome Tenets, nor to Reforme those vices* [which raign'd amongst them] *But* rather *made use of the Peoples Ignorance, and withall of their Superstition, which, arising out of their ignorance, administred nourishment unto their vices, to promote their* [selfish and

Vidi à Scholastich --- *multa introducta dogmata* --- non ex *Conciliorum Universalium Auctoritate*; *Dogmata verò in Conciliis stabilita minus ab illis commode, explicata*: *præterea inter Ecclesiæ præpositos eum invaluisse Typhum & Avaritiam, & mali exempli mores, ut ii*---

and sordid [*Interest.*] Now Sir observe what you have done. You have not onely *hudled up* the things that are *different* and *distinct*, but you have ended with an *&c. cætera*, which cut's off the Prime of your Account. As if you durst not make it known to your English Readers, how deeply *Grotius* had charged the *Popish Prelates, and Schoolmen*, for fear your bitterness towards Grotius should lose its sting, and that in the *act* of its exercise, or execution. To what purpose do you ask, *if the Council at Lateran and Florence did not decree that the Pope is above a Generall Councill*; when you knew that *Grotius* was quite against it? They are *the Generall Councils* which Grotius had in great Reverence, of which the *Lateran* and *Florentine* you know were *None*, unless your knowledg is less then I would very fain think it. Grotius was constant to *the Rules*, of Wise *Vincentius* of *Lyra*, and adhered to those things which were *alwaies, and every where, perseveringly deliver'd* in what Church soever he Chanc'd to find them; which whosoever doth not, cannot be a *true Christian*. He did not *hold all in the Council of Trent*, (as you often calumniate, but never prove,) but told us what might be done, for the love of *Peace*, for the Accomodating of *that* to the Protestant Synod at *Augusta*.

I thank you for your promise, *never to call me an Arminian*; but not for making me a *Papist* in the very next period. If you are grieved, *that in these Churches, I and the men of my mind have leave given us to be Rectors*, you may ease your self by a *Course at Law*: For you are never like to do it by writing Books, though 'tis said of *you*, as of *him* in *Scotland*, That you can put them out *as oft, as your Belly akes*. Whilst you say that such professors, as Master *Hickman, and your self, cannot have licence to be Rectors, no nor so much as to escape the strappado in my Church*, you either meane you are *departed* from the true Church of *England*, or that I am *revolted* to that of *Rome*. If the first, you confesse your own *Schism*; If the second, God will rebuke you for your *Slander*.

Sect.

Sect. 12. When you have done with my *Advertisement*, you have not yet done with *me*. And for want of *new* forces, to make a stand against *Evidence* of Truth and Reason, you repete a great part of your *Grotian Religion*, as if you thought a *Repetition* were æquipollent to a *Reply*. First, you scruple not to say, [*That Grotius his Religion is that which is conteined in the Council of Trent with all the rest*, p. 386.] Yet in the passage which you translate, there are these things against you. * 1. He saith that *those Acts may be commodiously explained, by the marginall Citations both out of Scripture and Ancient Doctors*, not that they ought to be received in gross, *without* such commodious explications: where by the way you may amend your gross *mistake* in the Translation, by carrying the *adverbs* to the *verb*, which you have link'd unto the *substantive*, mistaking the *Ablative*, for the *Dative Case plural*. And by this you have perverted the Authors sense. 2. He saith that this may be done in any man's judgement, *who hath a mind propense to Peace*. In order to the *unity and peace* of *Christendom*, all the most *favourable Constructions*, must be put upon the Doctrins of either party. And by whom is this to be said, but by a *Professed Reconciler*? 3. So far is Grotius from turning Papist, though such *commodious explications* should be allow'd him, (as some have taken the Covenant, and Engagement too in their *own sense*, who would not take it in the *Imposers*) that nothing less will *content* him (no not in order to publick Peace) than a Removall and * *Abolition* of those Corruptions in the Church, which had obteined their Introduction by *evill manners and customes*, *not by antient tradition, or the Auctority of Councils*. 4. He doth not say he *is content with what he hath*, but that he † *shall have that wherewith he may be contented*, upon this * *condition* or *proviso*, *that Reformation shall be made*. 5. He condition's that this be done † *by Kings and Bishops* in their respective places of Jurisdiction, without taking notice of the *Pope*, whose *consent* he thought *needless* as well as *impossible*

Compare this with Sect. 14.

* Inveniet ea commode & convenienter, tum S.S. tum veterum Doctorum locis ad marginem positis, posse explicari. *Discuss.* p. 14.

Quorum Acta si quis leget animo ad pacem propenso, Is inveniet, &c.

* *Tollantur* ea, quæ cum pia ista Doctrinâ pugnant, &c. Ibid.

† *Habebit* id quo *possit* esse contentus.

* Quod *si pretera* tollantur ea, &c.

† Quod si, *cura Episcoporum & Regum* tollantur ea,

possible to be bad. 6. He add's the chief thing, (which you were pleas'd to take no notice of unto your Readers, hopeing they would not take the paines to examin Grotius in his Original) * That the Augustan Confession doth not desire any thing else, in order to a closure of both the Churches. He add's the Profession (not onely of Zanchie, a single Protestant, but) of the Protestant Princes and Cityes, De nullo articulo Fidei dissentire se ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ: sed paucos abusus à se omitti, qui novi sunt, & contra voluntatem Canonum, vitio Temporum, recepti. You see that Grotius hath expressed a lesser propensity to the Papists, than the Protestants who adhere unto the Augustan Confession, which of all the Protestant Confessions is judged by Grotius to be the best and of the greatest Authority, as being Received in some Kingdomes, and in some of the greatest Principalities, and in diverse free Cities or Commonwealths. Bucer was one of that Synod, who (you know) was assisting to our true English Reformation.

* Nec aliud desiderat Confessio Augustana, Ibid. Ibid.

Et optima est & auctoritate maximâ, quippe in Regnis aliquot, &c. Discuss. p. 15.

Now what a hard hap is this, that That must be Popery in Grotius, which is not such in any one else? Let all the Kingdomes and Common-wealths which embrace the Augustan Confession be reckon'd Papistical, as well as Grotius; or else let Grotius be a Protestant, as well as Them. But you are implacable to Grotius, who must be therefore what you will have him, rather then want a staff to beat that Dead lyon, (who can less resist you than a live Dog) you are resolv'd to call it * his way to Peace, aut per Papa eximiè boni authoritatem, aut Concilium Generale, &c. (Vot. pro pace p. 9.) which, your Eyes have made your Conscience witness, was the way of some other pacifick Persons. Did you not know the true English of vidi eos in id incumbere Omnes— and again, eos sentire iucundas vias——? Besides, of † three waies, you name but two. 1. The Authority of a Pope extremely good. 2. Or a Generall Council, rightly call'd during the vacancy of the Popedome, (which later words you leave out.) 3. Or the Conferences of Kings directed by the Bishops with that intent, that the Result of their Thoughts might be brought to the See of Rome, as nothing

* This you do in your. Cat. Relig. p. 39.

† Eas autem esse Tres. Vot. p. 9.

nothing else but a *Coagulum*, a kind of *cement*, and *meaves of Concord*. This whole third way you would not mention.

Sect. 13. You object against Grotius, that *In interpreting places of Scripture, He professed he would not cross the Rule, which was delivered by himself, and by the Council of Trent.* p. 386 But you *name* not the *Rule*, nor direct your Reader where to *find* it. If you knew it *not* your self, why would you vilify you *knew not what*? And if you wanted no knowledg of it, why would you argue *against* your knowledg? Why would you brand him as a *Papist* for adhering to a *Rule*, which is the Rule of the *Protestants*, as well as Papists? I will convince you of your rashness (from whatsoever principle it issued out) by telling your Readers the very *Rule*, of which you either were *ignorant*, or else *dissembled* your understanding. It was * *the most prudent* [and Protestant] *Rule, of not Interpreting Scripture against the* [full and] *unanimous consent of Fathers*. Are you so neer to the *Socinians*, as to *decry* such Rules as *These*? Or is every thing *Popish*, for being approved by the *Council* of *Trent*? Go to Sir, go to; I understand you better and better. The better to make you understand your self, I am to mind you of the *stile* which Grotius speakes in. † *Nihil fecisset Grotius ne contra Synodum quidem Tridentinam*. If *you* should say of your self in some particular, *That in this you do nothing contrary even to the Council of Trent*, would any man from *hence* conclude you a *Papist*, and not rather the *contrary*? Consider the force of *Ne quidem*, and you will know what you have done. Again, the addition of those words (immediately after the place you cite.) *Quam multò melius intellexit Alcazar*, doth shew a *different meaning* of the Place, then you were willing to apprehend. He speakes of his *own Interpretations* of some Places of *Isaiah*, against which it was objected, that he receded from *those* of the antient *Fathers*. But he * answers to the objection (p. 182.) That to Places of Scripture, *especially Historical and Prophetical Places, It is lawfull to bring new expositions, so that they be not repugnant to Doctrine antiently deliver'd*. And this

Discuss. p. 185.

*Regula prudentissima ejus Synodi de non interpretandâ Scripturâ contra unanimem Consensum Patrum, &c. *Discuss. p. 182. lin. 30.*

† *Ibid.*

* Non obstat (Regula) quò minus ad loca Scripturæ, historica præsertim aut Prophetica, adferatur nova expositio, &c.

this liberty be cites from the *Romanist Alcazar*. (p.183.) adding *Maldonate*, and others, and so going on, till he concludes, *That by the advice of learned men*, He will use this liberty; but so as *not to crosse the Rule*, which *Himself* hath set unto *himself* as well as *that Council*, (to wit the Rule of doing nothing against the joynt consent of the Fathers) which *Alcazar understood*, as well or *better than* Mr. *Rivet*. Where it is evident, what he speakes is of the *liberty* he useth in his Interpreting of Scripture, not of *enslaving* himself unto the Council of *Trent's* Interpretations; but he will use his liberty in such a manner, as not to break his *own Good Rule*, though it is *also* the *Rule even of that very Council*. If our Enemies, the Papists, do make a *good Rule*, or repete it rather from *Vincentius Lirinensis*, we may observe it as being *good*, though not as made or repeted by *him*, or *Them*.

Discuss. p. 139. *Sect.* 14. You adde out of *Grotius*, *That the Augustan Confession commodiously explained, hath scarce any thing which may not be reconciled with those opinions which are received with the Catholicks, by Authority of Antiquity and of Synods, as may be known out of* Cassander *and* Hoffmeister; *and there are among the Jesuites also who think not otherwise*, p.386,387.] All the weight of this Testimony doth lie on that phrase, *Dogmata quæ Antiquitatis & Synodorum authoritate sunt recepta*. And what injury is it to the *Augustan confession*, to think it may be so *reconciled*? reconciled with those *Dogmata*, which the Catholicks have from *Antiquity*? If some of the *schereest* of the Jesuites, such as *Petavius* and *Sirmondus*, would (for the love they bear to peace) subscribe the *Augustan Confession*, it might be much for the *honour*, but could not be for the *prejudice* of our Religion; for if we rejoyce for the Conversion of now and then a *Jew*, why not for that of a *Jesuite* also? Again, supposing that *Grotius* had been able, in his own sense to subscribe the *Trent Articles*, (in order to the peace and unity of Christendom) it would no more be an Evidence of his being turnd *Papist*, than of any Papist's turning *Protestant*, who should subscribe the Augustan Confession. * The ve-

* *Compare this with Sect.* 11.

ry

ry utmost of your Objections against *Grotius* is, that he design'd to deal with the *Articles* of *Trent*, as *Sancta Clara* with the *Articles* of the *Church* of *England*; to wit, by drawing them aside to another Sence, than what is most obvious in the words themselves. And admit it were so indeed; yet 1. He had *better grounds* for it than *Sancta Clara*, to wit, the places of *Scripture*, and *Ancient Doctors* in the Margin, which may *be* used as a *Key* to *unlock* their meaning when it is *Doubtful*. And if the meaning of the *Text* is truely agreeable to the *Margin*, there is then a just ground of *publick peace*, in case the *Scripture* and *Antiquity* do contain a *good meaning*, which I hope you will not refuse to grant me. 2. But however you must be minded, that *this* is a thing which the *Papists* do most of all *blame* in our *Reconciler*, to wit, his assuming so great a liberty, as to *misinterpret* their *Definitions*. Just as we who are Protestants do lay a blame upon *Sancta Clara*, for misexpounding our Articles against *our mind*. From whence, notwithstanding the Papists were never so irrational, as to conclude that *Franciscus à Sanctâ Clarâ* turn'd *Protestant*: Much *less* may we infer that *Grotius* turn'd *Papist*, from his making their *Doctrins* comply with *Scripture*, who had wrested the *Scripture* to serve their *Doctrins*. 3. If he could find a *sense* in the *words* of *Trent*, which being agreeable to *Scripture* and to the *Protestant Confession*, might be by *Protestants* subscribed to, what hurt were it to *us*, or gain to *them*? Even *This* would evince him to be *no Papist*. For if he were, what *need* could there be of such *commodious Explications*? 4. Adde to this, (as I said before Sect. 12.) his *Quod si præterea, But if besides*; (not *and if* as you translate it) noting this to be *required* yet *further* towards a peace, (before the *peace-Maker* himself can rest *contented*) that all the Errors of the *Papacy* be taken away: which having never been introduced by *Authority of Councils, or ancient Tradition*, (meaning no other Councils then what are *ancient*, agreeable to the *Tradition* which comes immediately after) he resolves may be *Reformed by Kings and Bishops* in their several Regions, without the making of

Quod si præterea tollantur ista quæ cum piâ istâ Doctrinâ pugnant, &c.

of any *Breach* in the Church of God. 5. And once for all let it be noted, That *Grotius* his use of that * phrase, (which you lately perverted to your own ends) is onely to signify against the *Romanist's Errors*, that they are not introduced by *antient Tradition*; and therefore wanting that Authority to which they lay a dishonest claim, they are unquestionably fit to be taken away.

* *Especially taking in an old Tradition, &c.* p.386.

Discuss.p.71. *Sect.* 15. What you recite out of Grotius in your *p.*387. Must receive its true sense from the words of the Author *before*, and *after*. You must observe the Resolution both in *France*, *and else where*, * *That no one Council is to be reckon'd for universall, which is disliked either by all, or by the major part of the Patriarchal Sees.* This then must assure us what his Notion is of *Councils*, when he speakes of them in *gegerall* without naming *which*. And for the passage which you cite, I pray Sir, tell me; *Hath not France the Scriptures and the Dogmata*, (that is the *Doctrins*, in *this* place, not the *opinions*, as you translate it,) explained in the *four Oecumenical Councils*, and *also the Decrees against Pelagius*? If so, why do you quarrell? if not, why do you say, *that you esteem that Nation an honorable part of the Church of Christ*? (*Grot.Rel.p.*10.) If you did not strive to deceive your Reader, why did you not faithfully translate the passage, but purposely leave out the *speciall words*, which would have served to *clear* their *Author*? you know his sentence is plainly this, *That in those Churches which joyne with the Roman, not onely the Scripture doth still remain, but the Doctrins also explained in the* GREAT COUNCILS, Those of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*, *Chalcedon*, *and the Things decreed against Pelagius by the Bishops of Rome*. But in *your* Translation, you neither express the word *Great*, (which is of vast consequence) nor do you name so much as *one* of the *four Great Councils*. As if you were *willing* that your Readers should imagin,

* Interim & in Galliâ & alibi, Duo constare video; neque pro Concilio universali habendum id quod à Patriarchalibus sedibus aut omnibus aut plurimis est improbatum, &c.

In Ecclesiis illis,—non Scriptura tantùm manet, sed & dogmata, explicata in *Magnis Synodis*, *Nicæna*, *Constantinop.* *Ephesinâ*, *Chalcedonensi*. *Discuss.* p.71.

imagin, he might meane some partiall and *trivial Councils*, and lay as much weight upon such as those, as if indeed he had been a *Papist*. Now concerning the *Canons* of those *great Councils*, for *Reformation* of manners in the *Bishop of Rome*, (which Grotius call's, for that reason, *Egregious Constitutions*,) They are also received by *Rome it self*. And were they put in *execution*, there could not be any such thing as *Popery*. Because according to *those Canons*, the Bishop of Rome must quit his claim to the *Universality* of his *Pastorship*, or to his being an *Universal Judicial Head*, and must leave the Church to be *govern'd* by her sevoral *Primates*. Hence it tis that such wise and pacifick Protestants, as *Melanchthon*, *Isaac Casaubon*, *Grotius*, and *Bishop Bramhall*, do still exact a Reformation *Secundum Canones*. Yet this is but *one* of those *many* things, for which good Canons have been enacted. And thus you see at every time, how very little you were qualified to intermeddle in these Things.

Sect.16. The next passage you translate in as *fraudulent* a manner as any other. Read and Repent what you have done. *These are the things, which thanks be to God the Catholicks do not thus believe, though many that call themselves Catholicks so live as if they did believe them: But Protestants (so live) by force of their Opinions, and Catholicks by the decay of Discipline, p.387.*] First you omit the word [*Quidam*] which is of greatest moment to shew the meaning of the Author; as if you had purposely laid a *Trap* for your *illiterate* Readers, to make them *fall* into a *hatred* of so incomparable a man, for having written thus *sharply* against *Protestants in general*; whereas, you know, *he* onely spake of *some* * *certain Protestants*, who live wicked lives by force of their Doctrines or Opinions. And do you know any *one Protestant*, who will not say the very same? 2. You do not take the least notice, what *kind of Doctrine* his words belong to: Indeed if you had, you had spoiled your own plot: For the passage refers unto the † Doctrine of *Uncon-*

Discuss. p. 48.

* Sed Protestantes *quidam* ex vi Dogmatum, &c. *lin.13.*

† Quomodo vivas, nihil interest. *Sine conditione* pro pœnâ quam ipsi debent satisfecit Christus. Sine Conditione gloriam æternam ipsis est meritus. *Ibid.*

ditionall

ditional Promises, unconditional Satisfaction, unconditional Glory. And did he not say very truly, that *Catholicks do not believe this, though many live as if they did?* Did he not as truly say, that (at least) *some* Protestants do hold these Doctrines, and *live accordingly?* you see the whole fault is in your *treetherous translation.* You *promise* me to *translate as well as you can,* (p.383.) If to do it very *falsely*, is *as well as you can,* I will not taxe you for *breach* of *promise,* But then repent of your gibeing, *p.383. l.penult.*

Sect.17. Your next Quarrel to *Grotius* is for calling the *Roman Church the* Mistress of other Churches, p.387.*] But in *this* your misfortunes are more than *One.* For 1. He speaks of the Roman Church, not in her *present* but *ancient* state; and this you could not but know, if you knew the English of *jam olim senserit.* Or if you read as far as those words, *qua tempora respiciens Grotius,* (p.96.l.1.) 2. *Zanchy* was a strict Protestant, and (which is more *against you*) a *Presbyterian*; yet he professeth the *Roman Church* to have been *pure* whilst she was *ancient,* and desires no more for her *Reformation,* than that she *return to her former self.* Look back on *chap.1. p.23.* and you will find in my *Margin* his words *at large*; words most worthy your meditation. You will find in the same paragraph the affirmation of *Blondel,* (which being *there* in *Latin onely,* I will *here* give you in *English*) * *That the Dignity of the Roman Apostolical Bishoprick* [*or Set*] *is not denyed by the Protestants, no nor her primacy over the Neighbouring Churches, and in some respect over* † *all the Churches, but this by the Protestants is referred to her Ecclesiastical Right.* Is this an Argument to prove that *Blondel* turn'd *Papist,* who lived and died the chief *prop* of the *Presbyterians*? yet this is every whit as good, as *any* you bring against *Grotius.* 3. It is the point of *Pradestination,* which occasions *Grotius* to use those words, wherein the *Arminian Presbyterians* do jump with *Rome.* And when he calls her a * *Mistriss,* (not to *tyranize,* but) to *teach* her Neighbours, he calls her no more than indeed she *was*; she having been often *appealed to* by *other Churches,* as by the *African,* and the *French,* when any

* *Discuss. p.95.*

* look back on *ch.1.p.22.*

† & aliquatenus *super omnes.*

* *aliarum Magistra.*

any point of *Tradition* was called in Question. You † profess your *very honourable and grateful thoughts of the Jesuits and Friers for* their labours to convert *the Infidel Nations unto the Faith*, of which you will not deny the *Roman Church* to be the *Mistress*. 4. Higher Titles than *this* have been afforded to that Church by the Apostolical Father * *Irenaeus*, who allow'd her no less than a *Principality*, in regard of which he thought it *needful that all other Churches should be conformable to This, as being the greatest and the most ancient, and known to all to have been founded by the most glorious pair of Apostles St.* Peter *and St.* Paul. *Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter* potentiorem Principalitatem, *necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undiq; Fideles; in quâ semper ab his qui sunt undiq; conservata est ea quæ ab Apostolis Traditio.* The reason of this (I suppose may be fitly given out of *Eusebius*: Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος —γεγραφὼς ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγέλιον, τοῖς Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. In a word, if you will know how great a *Deference* hath been given to the *Roman Church*, by such as St. *Cyprian*, *Tertullian*, St. *Ambrose*, St. *Jerom*, St. *Austin*, *Sozomen*, and divers others among the Ancients, nay by such as our Protestant King *James*, and learned *Bucer*, and Mr. *Calvin himself*; *Grotius* his * *Discussio* will strait inform you. 5. What *Grotius* saith he *will subscribe with a most ready mind*, is nothing else but the true Doctrin of *Predestination*, and other Doctrines depending on it, which all the *Remonstrant Presbyterians* are as ready to subscribe, as any *Grotius*. And what is this to his turning *Papist*? no more than it is to the *Dominicans* being turned *Presbyterians*.

† *Grot. Rel. p. 8.*

* *Iren. adversus Hæres. lib. 3. c. 3. mihi p. 232.*

Euseb. Hist. l. 5. c. 8.

* *p. 68, 69, 70.*

Sect. 18. The next passage which you cite from p. 7. (in your p. 387.) is much the same with what you cited from p. 14. and may be sent for its Answer to the 12th. *Section* of this *Appendix*, but yet I will adde, that *this* makes more to your disadvantage; because it makes it more manifest, how *that* passage was to be rendred concerning the *Scriptures and the Fathers (in the Margin of the Articles)* being made a *fit medium* for a *commodious Interpretation*; and so it

Discuss. p. 7.

it shew's you the less excusable, that when you had seen *both Places*, you should yet be guilty of such a *misinterpretation*. 2. There is added in that place, That Grotius did set out the *Augustan Confession*, as well as the *Bull of Pius Quintus*; It being the part of a *Reconciler*, to compare the Pretenses of *either Party*, and then to pitch upon a *moderate commodius sense*, wherein *both Parties* may likely *meet*. But remember that the *middle* cannot be *either* of the *Extremes*; and therefore Grotius was *aequidistant* from a *Papist* and *Presbyterian*. 3. Whereas it is said, *that the Bull hath Articles in it besides those of the Creed, But that the Synod of Dort hath more*: First I answer that it is *True*, and therefore *blamelesse*, as will be acknowledged by any of the *Arminian Presbyterians*. Next that Grotius did onely use it as a most pertinent *retorsion* upon the *Man* with whom he was dealing. Mr. *Rives* who approved of the *Synod at Dort*, had no reason to object against the *Bull of Pius Quintus*, [its having *some Articles* besides those in the *Creed*,] because his own *Synod of Dort* had many *more*. Compare with *both* (if you please) Mr. *Baxter's Confession of Faith*, and that of the *Westminster Assembly*, wherein (it seemes) there were *added* so *many* Articles to the *Creed*, that the Parliament thought fit to lay aside a * great *many*, yet such a *confidence* there was in that *Assembly*, that they posted their Issue into the World, *before* the *Parliament* had declared their Resolutions about it. Which though I guessed at before, by the *Division* I had observed amongst † the 92. *Ministers within the Province of London*, whereof a Party did still *waite for the Pleasure of the Houses*, whilst a greater party of the *same Tribe* would not be patient of such delay; yet I never knew it so fully, as since I saw the *Declaration of the Congregational Churches*, wherein the *Dealings* of the *Assembly* are very usefully * exposed to *publick view*. 4. As for the *Novity* or *Newness* of those *Articles in the Bul*, That must be judged of (saith Grotius) by such a *right understanding of them*, as is to be taken from the *Scriptures and antient Doctors in the Margin*. And if it once come to *that*, they will *cease* to sound as *now* they do.

The Synod at Dort and Assembly-men add Articles to those in the Creed.

* Viz. *cap.* 30. & 31. & *Sect.* 4. *of c.* 20. & *also a great part of cap.* 24.

† *See the Testimony to the Truth of J. C. p.* 37.

* *Praef. p.* 10. & 12. 13.

do. How this project can be effected, without *forcing* and *wresting* the words of the *Council*, I must ingenuously profess I canno: hetherto understand. But *Grotius* his *understanding* could reach to see many things, which are *above* the comprehensions of *yours*, or *mine*. Or if he came short of such a way, as to which the Papists would have agreed, then the *Peace* which he designed was still to continue in his Design. And he would ever have this to object against them, that we Protestants had *offered* them *Termes of Peace*, Such, as by their own *Margin*, (to wit the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* there,) they stand obliged to accept of; And so the Blame of our Breaches is to be laid at *their dore*, who *refuse* such Termes of Reconcilement.

Now can you think it any detriment to the Protestant Cause, That we alone are the men, *who as much as in us lies would live peaceably with all men*? And that others of each *extreme* will rather continue *unreconcileable*? If you think it a *foolish* thing, in so *angelical* a Person as *Grotius* was, to propose such Termes as were so utterly unlikely to take effect, To this I answer two Things. 1. He professed to *lay-in* this Provision for *Posterity*, to which he maketh his *Appeal* in diverse places. He hop'd that men in tract of Time would grow to be *weary of contending*, and place *Religion in good life*, as now they do *in maintaining Parties*. 2. You have * professed for your own part, that you will *write* and *speake* for Peace, *though you saw not a man in the world that would regard it, or returne you any better thanks then a reproach*. And though you propose some Termes of reconciling the *Protestants* with *the Papists*, † *that the work may not seem to be utterly Hopeless*, yet you proclaim in your *Title-page* to your *Key for Catholicks*, That *your Proposals are made for a hopeless Peace*; as if you thought you had the Priviledge (above all other mortals) to *approve* what you *practice*, even whilst you *practice* what you condemn.

* *Grot. Rel. p. 6.*

† *Ibid. p. 29.*

Sect. 19. The passage about the *Reall Presence in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper*, (at the bottome of your *page*

The Real presence in the Lords Supper.

Discuss. p. 35. page 387,) is placed by *Grotius* in the * *midst* of many *more*, taken from *writers of all sorts*, both Antient and Modern; and amongst the modern, as well *Protestants*, as *Papists*; to shew the smalness of the difference, as to that particular. But of this you were resolved to take no notice. 2. He adds another passage of the *Council of Trent*, to wit that *This Sacrament is the spiritualll food of the Soul*. Another from the *Glose of the Canon Law*, a third from *Clement* the fourth, a fourth from St. *Bernard*, and then he shew's their affinity to *Philip Melanchthon*, *and the Waldenses*, to diverse *Protestant Churches*, and in a word to Mr. *Calvin*, who hath said as plainly as any of them, †[That *God doth not mock us with empty signes, but doth really exhibit what he doth testifie by the signes, the communication of his Body and blood. —That the very substance is given unto us, —That we are made partakers of the substance of his Body and Blood.*]

† *Calvinus*: Deum non ludere inanibus signis, sed reipsâ præstare quod per symbola testatur, communicationem Corporis & Sanguinis: ——verum substantiam nobis donari: ——substantiæ corp. & sang. nos fieri participes. p. 362.

Will you infer from hence that *Calvin* also turn'd *Papist*? or will you say the *Council of Trent* was as well *Protestant* as *Popish*, for saying that *Christ in that Sacrament is sacramentally present, and not according to the natural manner of existing*? in earnest I know not what should hinder you, could you but think it for your *Advantage*. 3. As for that which you adde, [And the Council hath found words to express it, *that there is made a change of the whole substance of the Bread into the Body, and the whole substance of Wine into the Blood, which conversion the Catholick Church calleth Transubstantiation,*] *Grotius* (you know) hath nothing *like* it; nor doth he any way appear to approve of that *notion*, nor to go a step further than *Melanchthon* and *Bucer*, nay the *Waldenses* and Mr. *Calvin*. Nay he approves the *Diallaction*, which was clearly written by a *Protestant*. The whole malignity of the passage lies wrapt in *your addition* about *Transubstantiation*; which yet you have set in such a manner, as I believe your english Readers will think you have taken it out of *Grotius*, if they do not observe what now I tell them, That *Grotius hath*

not

not any such thing; but that all the *Addition* is *your Device*. Your Translation is also faulty in two respects, for the Latin runs thus, *Jesum Christum verum Deum et & hominem, verè, realiter, ac substantialiter, sub specie earum rerum sensibilium contineri*. Your English thus, *Jesus Christ true God and truely man, is really and substantially contained under the form of those sensible things*: applying *verè* to *hominem* which belongs to *contineri*. Again, those words in the Latin, *assequi possumus*, you render thus, *we may be certain*: of which as I see not *any* reason, so I verily believe you will shew me *none*.

Sect. 20. What *Grotius* saith of the *Synod*, [*that when the Synod of Trent saith, the Sacrament is to be adored with divine worship, it intends no more but that the Son of God himself is to be adored, in your p.*388.] he citeth out of the *Synods words*, which explicates herself, as he hath recited her explication, *Sess.*13. *C.*6.] And could it be possible for *Grotius* to do amiss in so doing? was it his *fault* that he did *not lye*? or is a man turned *Papist*, who relates a *matter of Fact* as he finds it *printed* before his *Eyes*? Is any Protestant to be blamed meerly for saying that the Papists do profess to worship none but the Son of God, when accused of *Idolatry* for yielding worship to bread and wine? Of what a *happy Generation* were you descended, that you can make a man *guilty* (though never so *innocent*) by somewhat *less* than an Affirmation? But to come from *Grotius* to the Papists, is it not absolutely *necessary* that they should make that Excuse, whilst they suppose (as they do) that the Elements are converted into the very body and blood of Christ? For we know in that Case, though *what* they worship is very *Bread*, which implie's them guilty of *material Idolatry*, yet *Christ* is That which they *mean* to worship, which free's them from the guilt of being *formally Idolatrous*. It is not *Popery*, to do the Papists *no wrong*. The way to convince and convert them, is to accuse them *in measure* of their Corruptions. A *Puritanical* opposition *conformes* a *Papist*, and make's him conclude he is *Orthodox*, because he *Conquer's*.

Material and Formal Idolatry.
Discuss. p. 79.

Two sorts of Papists. Discust. p. 15.

Sect. 21. Your two last passages out of *Grotius*, (which you sadly translated in your *p.* 388.) are joyned together in his *Discussio*, *p.* 15. and tell us *what Papists he understood, when he spake of them in an Epistle.* And what hurt can there be in either part? Did not *Grotius* do well, in calling *those* men by the name of *Papists, who approve of all the sayings and deedes of Popes, and that without any difference?* What a Papist must *you* be thought, if you will not call *such* Papists, as well as *Grotius*? But I perceive, by what you say in your *Grotian Religion*, (p. 58, 59.) You collect from those words, (or would make your Reader at least believe it) that *none were Papists with Grotius, but such as these.* [*You hope there be few Papists in the world, if these Onely be Papists*, p. 59.] Nor can you mean any otherwise, but by denying that These are Papists. Here then I must shew you as great a *wilfulness* or *weakness* in your objection, as was ever committed by any Writer in this kind. For in the page by you cited, *Grotius* make's a Distinction of *two sorts of Papists*, (as you have often times done* your self,) and tell's Mr. *Rivet* which sort he *meant*. Not, which he meant in *all* places, but *in illâ Epistolâ, in that particular Epistle*, which *Rivet* spake of. Marke the *end* of the period, as well as the *beginning*. [*Papistas Grotius in illâ Epistolâ —— eos intelligebat, qui sine ullo discrimine Omnia Paparum Dicta Factaq; probant, honorum aut lucri, ut solet fieri, causâ*: Non eos, *qui, salvo jure Regum & Episcoporum, Papæ sive Episcopo Romano eum concedunt Primatum, quem mos Antiquus & Canones & veterum Imperatorum & Regum edicta ei assignant.* Here are distinctly *two sorts* of Papists described to us. In the *Epistle* spoken of, he meant the *former*, who promiscuously approve of *all* that come's from the Pope, right, or wrong; good, or evil; not the *later sort of Papists*, who allow the Pope such a * *Primacy*, as Antient Custome and the Canons and the Edicts of Emperours and Kings do assigne unto him. Did you not know, that the second [*eos*] was a pronoun Adjective, as well as the *first*? And that *Papistas* was the *Substantive*, with which they did equally *agree*? Dr. *Kendal*

* *Grot. Rel. p. 9. Sect. 4.*

* Note that the *later sort* of Papists are *agreed with* in this *one particular* by *Melanchthon*, Bishop *Bramhall*, *David Blondel the Presbyterian*, and many more.

dal would have said (in such a case as this is) That *a little more of the Grammar-School would have done you no harm.* If you shall plead in your excuse, that your offense was committed through *want of Charity* towards *Grotius*, not through any the least *defect* of *skill* in *Grammar*, you will enforce us to believe you a better *Scholar*, than a *Christian.*

2. But suppose it were, as you affirm it; yet considering what is meant by *sine ullo Discrimine*, there can be no such *ill* in it, as you *suggest*. For they who *approve* of as many *sayings* and *doings* of the *Pope*, as they discern to have *Truth* and *reason* in them, and also *disapprove* of those, which have *no* appearance of truth and Reason, (amongst whom you may reckon the *Presbyterian* Followers of *Arminius*, who applaud the Decree of *Pope Innocent the tenth*,) cannot properly and strictly be called *Papists*. Next, what hurt is there in adding, that they who thus approve of *all* that come's from the Pope, do it either for *honor's*, or *Lucre's sake*? Sure they do it not for *God's*, or for *Conscience* sake. And being not on *Christian*, it needs must be on *carnal Grounds*. The chief of which in this matter are *Gain*, and *Greatnesse*. Some indeed there are or may be, who may do it onely out of *Ignorance*. But to the consideration of such as *Those*, he had no occasion to descend in that particular passage of which we speak.

3. The *negative part* of the whole sentence, which you cut asunder from the *Affirmative*, and set in lieu of a *New Argument* against its Author, (whether more *wilfully*, or *weakly*, time will shew,) I have shew'd you the meaning of, in the *first part* of this Section. But here I will add for your behoof, that there are *Papists* in the world, who are therefore call'd by the name of *Papists*, because they continue in *Communion* with the *Church of Rome*, and yet do concur with many *Protestants* (as well of the *Presbyterian*, as the *Episcopal* way,) touching the *Primacy* of *Order* which doth belong to *that See*. From whence we must not conclude, that *Thuanus* turn'd *Protestant*, but that he was a *moderate Papist*. Nor that *Blondel* turn'd *Papist*, but that he

he was (in this point) a very *moderate Presbyterian*. Remember the words of *Bishop Bramhall* * [*Cyprian gave a Primacy or principality of Order to the Chair of* St. *Peter, as Principium unitatis; so do we.*] And yet you profess of *this learned Bishop*, † *that you do not take him for a Papist*. If to *agree* in many things, whilst in many others we *disagree*, we're to be of *one* Church, or of *one* Religion; then would the Papists be *all* Protestants, and *all* the Protestants would be Papists; when Dr. *Owen* thought *you had inrolled him into the Troop of Antinomians*, you pleaded fairly for your self, *that you reckon'd not all to be Antinomians who held only some one or few of their Opinions*. How then could you resolve to reckon *Grotius* among the *Papists*, who came no nearer unto the Papists, than the Papists come to the Protestants? No man living can be a *Papist*, for this one thing, of allowing the Pope *such a Primacy* as *Grotius* speakes of, but denying him the Prerogative of being the *universal Pastor*, or the *Supreme head and Governour* of the Catholick Church. And *Grotius* give's a good reason in his following words. * Because the Priviledge of the said *Primacy* was by the *common consent* [*of the Antient Church*] ascribed rather to the *Church*, then to the *Bishop* of *Rome*; as having been the *most eminent* of all the Churches in the world, I say the *most eminent* in two respects. In respect of the *Purity of her Faith*, when *first* she was planted by the *two chiefest* of the Apostles, St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; and in respect of the *City Rome*, being consider'd as the † *Seat* of the *Western Empire*. So farre is this one consideration from shewing favour unto the *Papacy*, that 'tis a *principal Bulwark* set up *against* it. 1. It follow's unavoidably that the Pope cannot pretend to the *granted Primacy*, *from the words of Christ unto* St. *Peter*, but only from the *common consent* of the *Church*, and so it is not by *Divine*, but *Ecclesiastical Right*.

* See your *Grot. Rel. p.* 22. 23.

† *Ibid p.* 23. *Sect.* 13.

Disp. of right to Sacram. 5. p. 485.

* Qui quidem Primatus non tam Episcopi est, quàm ipsius Ecclesiæ Romanæ, cæteris omnibus prælatæ communi consensu; &c. *Discus. p.* 15.

† Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες οἰκείτως ἀπονεμάσαντες τὰ πρεσβεῖα. Vide *Cod. Can. Eccl. Univ. Can.* 206.

right. 2. It is not granted unto the *Pope*, who may at any time *erre*, as *Liberius* did; but to the *pure unerring Roman Church*, (such as *Zanchie* the *Presbyterian* doth acknowledge her to have been,) which when the present Church of *Rome* shall appear to be, by such an impartial *Reformation* of her *Corruptions* as may reduce her to her *Primitive* and *purer self*, we shall be ready to pay her Her Ancient Honour. Nor do we gratify her at all, as *now* she is, by acknowledging (with the *Fathers*) that she was *Primitively pure*; because we are able to *demonstrate* the several *growths* of her *Corruption*. The light and evidence of which, as it doth *justify* our *departure*, so doth it make us *unexcusable*, if we preposterously *return*.

*Sect.*22. There is nothing more strange, than that from words so innocent as those you cite out of *Grotius*, (in your p.389.) you should conclude his *Design* to have had an *influence* upon *England*, in the changes which occasion'd our late civil Wars. For the Book you cite was the last he wrote, and so it was not very far from the final *conclusion* of all our *Wars*: or suppose it had been a great deal sooner, yet I am left to admire at what you are willing to *infer*. *Grotius* tells us that *his Labours for the peace of the Church were not displeasing to many equal* [*impartial*] *men*, not onely in *Paris* and *all France*, *but in Germany*, *Poland*, *and England too*. And that the men to whom his pains was pleasing here in *England*, were men of *mild Tempers and Lovers of peace*. Such as to whom he opposeth the *raging Brownist*, *better suiting with Mr.* Rivet, *then with the Bishops of England*. From hence you conclude, (I wonder why) *He had Episcopal Factors here in England*. If you mean *Factors* to bring in *Popery*, I demand your proof or your repentance; if *Factors* for *Peace*, you have my *pardon*. Tis pity so many sheets of paper as you have written and printed on this one Subject, should all conclude with nothing better than *a confident begging of the Question*. Yet mark the *bottom* of the *Invention* with which you have been so long a *brooding*. There is a party of Prelatists here in *England*, who are Factors for *Grotius*, and so Papists,

Grot. his design had no influence on our English changes. Discuss.p.16.

In Angliâ non pauci placidi pacisque amantes. Insanientibus Brownistis, quibuscum D.R. quàm à Angliæ Episcopis convenit, &c.

(this you know is the *scope* of all,) when *first* it is apparent that *Grotius* himself was *no such thing*. And *secondly*, the *Prelatists* are *not agreeable* to *Grotius*, in that for which he was *most suspected*; to wit, his thinking that the *Bull of Pius Quintus* may (for peace) be subscrib'd in a *commodious sense*. Wherein, as I am not of *Grotius* his mind, (I being not able to subscribe it in any sense I can imagin) so neither am I of Mr. *Baxter's*, that *Grotius* for this opinion may be concluded an *arrant Papist*: no, I find great reason to conclude the *contrary*. For had he been *really* a *Papist*, he might have subscribed those Articles *without* a commodious interpretation. And you have no pretense of proof that he ever subscribed them at all: He onely spake as an *Agitator*, a studious *Contriver* of publick *peace*, for which he made propositions, but *all conditional*; and shew'd how *far* he might *go* to so *great* an *End*.

He had no Church-preferment offer'd to him from hence.

Sect. 23. Whereas you say, *some tell you that* Grotius *had Church-preferment here offered him, and thought to have accepted it*, (p. 389.) you give me occasion to suspect, that either you *hear amiss* what you are *told*, or *do ill remember* what you *hear*, or imperfectly *relate* what you *remember*. 1. At best it is but a *hear-say*, and such, as if it were true, would prove him a *Protestant in grain*. 2. But *Grotius* was not a *Church-man*, and was a great deal *too old* to quit his *secular imployments* for the taking of *orders* here in *England*, whereby to be capable of *Church-preferment*. 3. All that lookes like truth in it, I think, is this; that the King of England having heard of his incomparable Merits, and of his Love to our English Church, did determin to offer him, if ever the times should prove *Peaceable*, some very honourable condition within this Realm: Perhaps the *Provostship* of *Eton* might have been suitable to the purpose, having been given a little before to some excellent persons of the *Laity*. Sir *Henry Savile*, Mr. *Murrey*, and after that, to Sir *Henry Wotton*. Yet this at most was but a *purpose*, which was never advanc'd unto an actuall *offer*.

2. Your conceived objection is not so strange, but your answer to it is somewhat stranger. For what can you mean by

by the *Church of England of the second Edition then in the Press?* Dating this (as it *must* be dated) about the *end of the war*, a little before the death of *Grotius*, not long before the death of the King, I know not what you will do for any good *meaning* of your *words*: was the Church of England then *Popish*, or was she *not*? if Popish, was she such either in *capite*, or in *membris*? I need not tell you your unhappiness, let your answer be what it will. You have * freed *the King* from the suspicion of being a *Papist*, although you make him much *inclined* to a *Reconciliation*. If she was *not* then Popish, you see how well you have written *against* your *own writings*.

* *Grot. Rel. p.* 105. 106.

3. I never heard that St. *Clara* was the Queen's *Ghostly Father*, nor can I imagin from what Familiar you may have received your *Intelligence*. I grant he continued a perfect *Papist*, for all he labour'd to reconcile the *Church* of *England's Doctrine* with that of *Rome*. But then you must grant (by the same reason) that *Grotius* continued a perfect *Protestant*, for all he proposed a Reconcilement of the *Tridentine* Articles with the *Augustan*. If St. *Clara* did the former, to draw the Protestants to be *Papists*, *Grotius* also did the later, to draw the Papists to be *Protestants*. Can the designs of *Grotius*, and St. *Clara* be both the *same*, when *Grotius* endeavour'd so to moderate, and soften Popery, as to *rob* it thereby of all its *poyson*? whilst St. *Clara* made it his business to *infuse* a *poyson* into the Articles of the Church of England? Behold a strange partiality. The poor *Protestants of England* must suffer on both sides. It pleaseth a *Papist* to interpret our *English Articles* as a Pacifick, and thereupon our *Archbishop* must needes be *warping* towards *Popery*: An eminent *Protestant* doth the *same* by the *Romish Articles*, which by analogy should infer that the *Pope* is *warping* towards the *Protestants*; But still it must be quite otherwise; this must also become an Argument against the *Prelatists of England*; who, if they approve of that *Protestant's Labours*, or but refuse to raile at him for being turn'd unto the *Papists*, must needes be turn'd *Papists* as well as *he*.

Franciscus à Sancta had a contrary design.

4. Why do you say, that I assure you of Grotius his *Followers* here in *England*? If you meane here are *Pursuers* of his *pacifick design*, I shall confidently challenge you to name *One man*, who is employed at present in any such enterprise. Not but that we do *desire* and *wish* for Peace as much as *any*; but seeing the Papists are more invasive and more at enmity with us then ever, we find it more *needfull* to betake our selves to our *defence*, then either to *offer* them *Termes of peace*, or to expect such from them as we can *yield to*. If you have read the late writings of Bishop *Bramhall* and Dr. *Hammond*, two impregnable *Propugners* of the *Protestant cause*, (and let the Reverend *Dean Cosins* be ever remembred as a *third*) you cannot but know that the *Prelatists* are more the adversaries of *Rome*, than the *Presbyterians*.

5. You aske in these words, [*Is it any more proof that* Grotius *was a Protestant for joyning with them, than that they are Papists who joyn with him?* ibid.] Thus whilst you aske, if it is any *more* proof, you implicitly confess it to be *as much*: that it must be *as much* you cannot modestly deny; and even *this*, *Ad Hominem*, will serve the turn. For tis plain you make them all *Papists* who joyn with *Grotius*, (whilst you call them the *Grotian Cassandrian Papists*) and therefore according to your reasoning, *Grotius* who joyn'd with our *Episcopal Divines* must have been a *prelatical English Protestant*.

6. What you adde of the *late King* doth serve to prove him a *Protestant*, and what you adde of Dr. *Bayly* doth serve to speak him a Papist, but what of this? *Grotius* was not that *Doctor*, any more than that *King*. Our Episcopal Divines made a discovery of the *cheat*, and reckon'd *Bayly* no other than what they *found* him, rather a man of the *sword* than a true *pacifick*. Though twas observed by learned *Montague*, that our *Puritans* were the men who did commonly *turn Papists*, yet he did not conclude they were the likelier to be *Papists* who *never turn'd*. No, to argue in such sort is your own *peculiar*.

Dr. Bayly cleared from an implicit Cassandry.

Sect. 24. What you cite from *J. B. to shew the judgement*

ment of those on whom the Judgment of Grotius *had any influence*, p. 390.] is every way to your prejudice. For 1. The Author is Dr. *Bezier*, a French Protestant by *birth* and by *education*, not one whit the likelier to have been po, ishly affected, for having been prefer'd by the *Bishop of Durham* to be a Prebend in that Church, the Bishop himself being so *contrary*, and that in your knowldge. 2. It is more then you know, that the Judgment of *Grotius* had any influence upon *His*, or that he ever took *Grotius* into consideration. Take heed of speaking things out of your meer *Imagination*. Dr. *Bezier* is a person, of whose *practise* in *France* I have been an Eye-witness; and that (I know) did evince him a *sober Protestant*. But 3. Why should not a *Frenchman* (preferr'd in *England*) have leave to wish for the *ancient Union*, so as each injoying their true Liberties, they might *reform* all Errors in point of Doctrin for *Themselves*? 4. The design of that Tract being to prove *against the Papists*, that in casting out the *Papacy* we are not guilty of *Schism* or *Heresie*, urging *Barnes his Book* as a good *Confession* on their side, and his monstrous usage for that Confession,) what need was there of more than to clear the Liberties of our Church? 5. Since the *Gallican Church* had the same Liberties with the *British*, He could not take a fitter *hint* to expresse his wish for *our Union*. 6. * What he speaks in their favour is only this, *That if the French Church would understand us rightly, and would thereupon remit of her present Rigor*, (which you know implies a Reformation) *our Agreement would be likelier than appears at first sight, to such as have not a knowledge of either Churche*. And will not *you* say as much as this of *that* or any *other* part of the *Roman Church*? certainly *these* are to be thought those very *tolerable terms*, upon which you profess for the French Papists, that *you would run with the forewardest to meet them*, (p. 390.)

* Si utraque pars absque prejudicio sese mutuò intelligeret, & pars extrema de rigore suo vellet remittere, ea Britannicæ Ecclesiæ cum Gallicanâ consensio non foret adeo improbabilis, atque primâ fronte videtur Ecclesiam utramque vel alterutram ignorantibus. *J. B. de Antiq. Eccl. Britann. libert.* p. 34, 35.

Sect. 25. Your odd Resolution, that *bellum & discordia non sunt nisi à pacificis & propter pacem*, (p. 392.) can onely be

Pacificks are not a Cause of Discord.

be verified through the wilfulness of the *unreconcileable*. For *Love* of *Peace*, by it self, would never be apt to make *war*. If any *contention* shall arise about the *meanes* of *union*, that again must be charged on them that *dislike* the mean's *propos'd*, and yet propose no better, nor more probable, perhaps much worse, and more unlikely to take a comfortable effect, whereas the *Pacifici*, if they really propose the very *best* meanes they can, and do the *utmost that in them lyes to live peaceably with all men*, as they cannot be *blameworthy* for doing *no more*, so 'tis their comfort, if they miscarry, that they have *freed their own soules*.

Of the Pope's Primacy.

Sect. 26. You seem to *forget* the thing in Question, when you inveigh against *an opinion of the necessity of an universal visible Head, p.* 302.] For the *Primacy* allow'd unto the *Pope* by the learnedst Adversaries of Popery, (*Melanchthon*, and *Bishop Bramhall*, Dr. *Hammond*, and *Blondel*, as well as *Grotius*,) is not an *universal Headship*, as that signifie's *Pastorship*, but (at the most) *a Patriarchate of the west*, which does not *imply* but *exclude* a *Monarchy*, and is exactly reconcileable with an *Aristocratick Government* of the *Church*. And even *this* is but according to the *Ancient Canons*, by which he is qualified (if he please) to *advance* the Honour of Christianity, but not to *hinder*, or *obstruct* it. Again, this *Primacy* thus allow'd is not so properly the *Proposal*, as the *Concession* of the Protestants, with a proviso that the Pope will require no more. And for the buying of *Peace*, I told you long since how great a price is to be paid.

How it removeth the whole mistake.

Sect. 27. To conclude the whole subject, and to remove the cause of your Mistakes, to make it very hard for you to persevere in your impertinence, or to make you unexcusable in case you do so, I give you warning to *distinguish* between the *New Romish Canons*, and the * *Ancient Canons of the universal Church*; between a *Primacy of Order*, and a *Supremacy of Power*; and not to *delude* your self any longer by fixing your thoughts upon the *one*, when *Grotius*

* Note, that the *four General Councils* were confirmed in *Engl.* by *Act of Parlament* in the first year of Queen *Eliz.* as Dr. *Featly* well observed in his Letter to the late *Primate*.

and

and other Protestants do not approve but of the *other*, You profess to approve of the *Pacifick design*. It was *Grotius* his judgement, that the likelyest way to make it take a good effect, is to take from the *Pope* his *universal Supremacy* over the Church, and to make him content himself with a *Primacy of Order*, as that *Principium unitatis* (for the peace of Christendom) which *Melanchthon*, *King James*, *Isaac Casaubon*, *Bishop Bramhall*, Dr. *Hammond*, *David Blondel*, and all intelligent Protestants have still allow'd him. By this meanes the whole Church should have one Common Regiment, under *Bishops*, and *Metropolitans*, and *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*; which as it is much *cast down*, if not *destroyed*, by the universall *Monarchy* of the *Pope*, so it well consists with his *Primacy* according to the Canons of Generall Councils. Upon these precise termes, an *universal peace* might be begun, if all Protestants would agree under the Government of *Bishops*, and the Popes descend from their *usurpations*; and all other things might be *reformed* by the Supreme *Magistrates*, and *Bishops*, in their respective places of jurisdiction. Now this being the utmost that *Grotius* pretend's towards a *Peace*, you are highly injurious, whilst you joyne the *Grotians* and the *French Papists* in making the Pope to be the *ordinary judicial Head*. (p.380.) For the *Ancient Canons* make him but *one*, although the *first* of five *Patriarchs*; and allow every *Primate* to be αὐτοκέφαλος in his own *Province*; as Dr. *Hammond* hath made apparent in his most satisfactory Treatise concerning *Schism*, which hath been twice or thrice *rail'd at*, but never *answer'd*. * Especially from the Canon of the *Ephesine Council*, in the particular cause of the *Archbishop* of *Cyprus*, *over whom the Patriarch of Antioch (though he extended his Patriarchate over all the Orient) was adjudged to have no manner of Power*.

*Dr. *Hammond* of Schisme Chap.5.Sect.6. p.100.

I hope you see your obligation to make amends for your *Calumny*; in which you cannot persevere, without incurring the danger of calumniating *others*, as well as *Grotius*, even the ablest Supporters of the *Protestant cause*. For Dr. *Hammond* hath told us, as well as *Grotius*, (and sure

Ibid.ch.3. p.59.

sure I am that they were *both* of the same Religion,) That *if we respect order and primacy of place, the Bishop of* Rome *had it among the Patriarchs, as the Patriarchs among the Primates, that City of* Rome *being the Lady of the World, and the seat of the Empire.* Again, speaking of the *preeminence* of the *Roman See* heretofore, though he denies her any *supreme Authoritative power over other Primates*, yet he allows her *a precedence or priority of place in Councils, an eminence in respect of Dignity, which is perfectly reconcileable with the* αὐτοκεφαλία *and Independence, the no-subordination or subjection of other Primates.* Thus our Reverend Dr. *Hammond*, whom, I am verily perswaded, you will not dare to call Papist, for fear of *derision* from your most popular Admirers. However you do acknowledge that Bishop *Bramhall* is a right *Protestant*, and *he* hath told you very lately, * *That the main Controversie, nay* (he thinks) *he might say the onely necessary Controversie between them and us, is about the extent of papal power. If the Pope would content himself with his* exordium Unitatis, *which was all that his primitive predecessors had, and it is as much as a great part of his Sons will allow him at this day, we are not so hard-hearted or uncharitable, for such an innocent Title or Office to disturb the peace of the Church. Nor do we envy him such a preeminence among Patriarchs, as St.* Peter *had (by the confession of his own party) among the Apostles.*

Ibid. ch. 5. p. 100. Sect. 5.

* Bishop Bramhall in his Schisme Guarded, &c. p. 4.

† Together with *this* compare his citation of Bishop *Andrews*, expressing his *own* sense, and the sense of King *James*, yea and the sense of the *Church of England.* To which having added the like sense of St. *Cyprian*, he doth thus very briefly conclude his *own*, * *This primacy neither the Ancients nor we do deny to St.* Peter, *of Order, of Place, of Preeminence. If this first Moversship would serve his turn, this Controversy were at an end for our parts.*

† Ibid. p. 24, 25, 26. Primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi Ecclesia & una Cathedra monstratur. *Cyprian. Epist. ad Antonium de Unitate Ecclesia.*

p. 26.

A Conjecture passed upon some Letters.

Sect. 28. It is not amiss to take notice of the *applauding Letters of which you boast*, (p. 393.) and to conjecture at their *design*, if there were any such things. Some who saw in

in your *Aphorismes* (and in some other things which you had publish'd) more of *Truth* and *Moderation*, than in other writings of Presbyterians, were willing to *pardon* many things which they saw *amiss* in you, for the love of that *Truth* of which they found you a *Patronizer*. No doubt but that *Charity, which hopeth all things*, did make them hope that *more study* would daily discover *more Truth*, which (for want of *good* study) you had not hitherto discern'd, and which as soon as you had *learn't* might serve to rescue your *Inward man* from all *schismatical* and *factious wayes*. In which charitable *hope* if they were very much *mistaken*, theirs was the *error*, but yours the *fault*; and you alone are accomptable for having so guiltily *deceived* their expectations. Their hopes of your Amendment (as well in some things as in others) were very *discreet*, as well as *sanguine*: for who could easily have *suspected*, that the *Presbyterians* by their *Railing* (at *you* and all that came *from* you) should more oblige you to *their side*, than others *reduce* you into the *way* by *gentle usage*? What if some of those *Epistlers* might write in *Latin*, (as it is credibly reported) it was not to *buffet* but to *oblige* you; and therefore you should not have entertained them as so many *Messengers of Satan*. Yet since I can but conjecture, I shall address my request to every one of those persons, whom you accuse of their *applauding and flattering Letters*, (for this you know is the language, with which you publickly requite them for all their favours) that they will clear their *Intentions* from this *Aspersion*, and say in the *uprightnesse* of their *Hearts*, whether they sent you kind Letters to drive on an Interest of their own, or onely to perfect your *Reformation*.

By whom our Breaches were first made, and are ever since widened.

Sect. 29. From the *second part* of your *Key for Catholicks*, I now return to your long *Preface* before your *five Disputations* of *Church-Government and Worship*, where you shew your *good breeding* to the best part of the *Nobility*, as well as of the *Gentry*, *and Commons of this land*, who still adhere unto the *Prelacy* so long established in the Church. You say indefinitly to *some*, *that they speak to the*

shame of their understandings, and uncharitableness, but you beseech them to bear it, if you touch the sore; for your work is healing. p. 2. You charge them *all* with want of *charity* to their *brethren*, meaning thereby the *Presbyterians*; and you adventure to judge of the reasons why. *In some there are confused apprehensions of the case. In some a co-interest and consociation with the Divines of their way. In some a stiffnesse and stoutness of disposition. In too many (miserable soules!) it is meer ungodliness and enmity to that way of piety, which appeares in many they differ from. In the best of them it is* (too bad) *a remissness of charity, and want of zeal for the Churches Peace, &c.* p. 23. Thus you bestow your *gentle touches* (as you please to call them) upon your *honourable, worshipfull, beloved Countrymen, the Nobility, Gentry, and Commons of this land who adhere to Prelacy*, p. 1. But they *must* not presume to take it ill: For you say, they have a *sore, which MUST be touch'd, and that you will do it as gently as the case will bear.* p. 2.]

The wrong sore rubb'd & Presbyterians gall'd upon the Prelatists backs.

1. Now I pray Sir reflect upon the yeares that are pass'd, and compare them with the state of things at present; consider the *Acts* of many *full* Parliaments, and compare them with the *Ordinance* of less than *one*; read the *Articles and Canons* of the *Church of England*, and compare them with the *medlings* of the *divided Assembly of Divines*; remember by whose power your *Assembly-men sate*, and against whose *prohibition* they boldly *acted*, with which compare their proceedings in contempt of *that power* by which they were called an *Assembly*; recollect what you have publish'd against the *Directory*, the *Covenant*, the *Presbyterian-worthies* and way of *Discipline*, and compare it all with your confessions of *Disobedience* to *Governours, doing hurt to the Church*, taking *excellent things from us which we were in actuall possession of*; and when you have done, tell me truly, whether (before you were awar) you have not been *rubbing* the *wrong sore*, and *galled* the *Presbyterians* upon the *Prelatist's backs*. For since you take in the *Clergy* of the *Episcopal way*, and say *we separate from you for other men's doing*, (p. 10.) I shall desire to know of you, who

are

are the *Schismaticks* and *Separatists* and so the *breakers* of *charity*, and *peace*, and *brotherly union*; We, who continue and persevere in the good old way of the Church of England, in which we were born and *baptiz'd*, and to which we have *vow'd* a due conformity and obedience; Or *you*, and your darling *Presbyterians*, who have *departed* from our Assemblies, and *separated* your selves from our Communions, *receded* meanly from your *subscriptions*, and bound your selves by an *oath* to *extirpate* your *Fathers* who were *over you in the Lord*, whom you had solemnly promis'd you would *reverently obey*? For brevities sake I refer you to my Ἐαυτοτιμωρούμενος *ch.* 2. *p.* 50, 51, 52.

The Prelatists beaten for being abused,

2. Again, I would gladly be inform'd, which sort of men are most unpeaceable, and injurious: We, who sought not *your* goods, Or you, who bereaved us of our *own*? We, who would fain have *sate still* in Peace, Or you, who *ruin'd* us (whilst you had power) with the specious stile of *Reformation*? We, who *complain'd* when we were wronged, Or you who *wrong'd* us? For pity do not *beat* us the first time for *nothing*, and then a second time beat us for *being beaten*. If we did you any *injury* by having *suffer'd extremely* without a *cause*, it was not ours, but *your fault*. For *all* we suffer'd was *against* our *wills*. We did no more *Court*, then *deserve* such usage. We would fain have injoy'd the many and excellent Advantages both spirituall and temporall, which by the *Petition of right*, and *the great Charter*, and other *Lawes* of the *Land*, as well as by the Statutes and Lawes of God, were as undoubtedly *our own*, as whatsoever it is which you are able to call *yours*. And will you *hate* us so far, as not to be able to forgive us, because you have wrong'd us in such a measure, as that you can never make us *amends*? When the *Fox* in the Fable is resolv'd to prey upon the *Lamb*, he quickly make's it a *Malefactor*. But when men are sadly *beaten*, for nothing else but their refusing to *break the peace*, they cannot certainly *break* it by being *beaten*.

They are earnest Desirers of Reconcilement.

3. Once more I would know, who are averse to a *Reconcilement*. We, who earnestly *desire it*, Or you, who

widen our breaches, with as little regret as at first you *made* them? We, who labour to *reduce* you to your ancient *Order* and *Uniformity*; or you, who have improved one *single* Schism into an *hundred*? Notwithstanding the hainous and horrid things, which you have *done*, and we *suffer'd*, God and the world is our witness, we do not shut you out from our *Communion*: Our Chappels and Churchdores lye *open* to you: We *contend* for your *Fellowship*, and daily *pray* for your *comming in*; if you, by name, should have occasion to pass this way, and present your self, with other *Guests*, at the holy *Supper* of our *Lord*, no man on earth should be more *welcome*. But if you and your Partners will continue your severall *separations*, and shut your selves out from our *Communion*, as it were judging your selves unworthy of the Kingdom of God, and *excommunicating your selves*, (without our *consents*, and against our *wills*, and in despight to our *invitations*,) we cannot do less than declare, that *we cannot help it*. We are no rigid exactors of *Reparation*. Do but *return* to our *Communion*, and we are *satisfied*. Do but *accept* of our *forgiveness*, and we are *pleas'd*. If you cannot agree with us in *every act* of our obedience to the *established Canons* of the *Church*, at least come back to that *station* from whence you *fell*, and no small matter shall ever part us.

The Church of England justified by the Confessions of her Deserters.

4. *You profess to be for Bishops, as well as we.* (p. 5.) you acknowledge *a stinted Liturgy is in it self lawful; and that in some parts of publick holy service it is ordinarily necessary; and that in the parts where it is not of necessity it may not onely be submitted to, but desired when the peace of the Church requireth it; that the Ministers and Churches which earnestly desire it should not by the Magistrate be absolutely forbidden the use of a convenient prescribed Liturgy, &c.* (p. 358. 359.) Nay farther yet you do acknowledge, *That the use of the Surplice being commanded by the Magistrate, you would obey him, and wear that Garment, if you could not be dispensed with. Yea though secundarily the whiteness be to signify purity, and so it be made a teaching sign, yet would you obey.* (p. 409. 410.) Next *for kneeling at the Sacrament,*

you

you say that *as sinfully as this gesture was imposed, you did for your part obey the imposers, and would do, if it were to do again, rather then disturb the peace of the Church, or be deprived of its Communion.* (p.411.) You confess *you see no reason to scruple at the lawfulness of the Ring in Marriage.* (Ibid.) *You say that Organs or other Instruments of Musick in God's worship, being a help partly natural, and partly artificial, to the exhilarating of the spirits for the prayse of God, you know no argument to prove them simply unlawfull, but what would prove a cup of wine unlawfull, or the Tune and Meter and melody of singing unlawfull.* (p.412.) Again for *Holy-daies* you confess, *That some time for God's worship besides the Lord's-day must be appointed, and God having not told us which, the Magistracy may, on fit occasions.* (Ibid.) Nay for the *great Holy-daies of the Church* to which you have the most aversion, (such as celebrate the memorial of Christ's *Nativity, Circumcision, Fasting, Transfiguration, Ascension*, and the like) you freely *profess to be resolved, if you live where such Holy-daies as these are observed, to censure no man for observing them*, nor would you deny them liberty to follow their *judgement if you had the power of their Liberties, &c.* (p.416.) *Yea more, if you lived under a Government that peremptorily commanded it, you would observe the outward rest of such a Holy-day, and you would preach on it, and joyn with the Assemblies in Gods worship on it.* (p.417.) *For the name and form of an Altar, you think it a thing indifferent, whether the Table stand this way, or that way. The primitive Churches* (you confess) *used commonly the names of Sacrifice, and Altar, and Priest, and you think lawfully, and you will not be he that shall condemn them.* (p.417.) Last of all *for the Cross in Baptisme, which you have most suspected to be unlawfull, you dare not peremptorily say it is unlawfull, nor will you condemn the Ancients and Moderns that use it, nor will you make any disturbance in the Church about it.* (p.418.)

5. After all these acknowledgments (& many more in other places) I wonder how you can excuse your *departure* from us, or what should keep you from your *return*. Will you not live

The Presbyterian Separatists apparently unexcusable.

live in Communion with us, because we observe the *Rites* and *Orders* of the Church, which you confess to be very *innocent*? Or do you abandon what is *innocent*, because we *use* it? Are *our Bishops* the worse for being *derived* from the *Apostles*, as our Reverend Dr. *Gauden* hath lately proved by an *induction*? Are they the *worse* for being in England ever since the first time that *Christianity* was *planted*? Or the worse for being *settled* by the *fundamental Lawes* of the British land? They are not the worse for being approved, and contended for unto the death, by the *learnedst* part and the most *pious* of the Reformed Churches, of which our *Confessors* and *Martyrs* do make up a great and a noble Army. That our Church was a *true established Church* (in the year of our Lord 1641.) You have so plentifully *granted*, that 'tis too late to *deny*. They that * *flye out from a true established Church, and run waies of their own, raising and fomenting Sects and Schisms amongst God's people*, are sent for their *Doom* (by our late Reverend Bishop *Hall*) to those notable words of the Apostle, *Rom.* 16. 17, 18. And whether or no the *Presbyterians* have not thus *flown out*, judge I pray by the † *last Chapter* of Dr. *Hammond's* Treatise concerning *Schism*. Or let the men of that way but lay their *hands* upon their *hearts*. Now when you seem to have profited (not a little) by that excellent *Preface* of Dr. *Sanderson*, (wherein you are personally concerned,) in coming up so far, as hath been shew'd, to the most *disputable* things of the Church of England, what can make you *stand off* at so great a *distance*? what kind of answer will you return unto your own expostulations? *Shall the breach be healed, or would you have it to continue*? If it must continue, tell us *why*, and *how long*? Would you have it go with us to Eternity? Do you censure us to Hell? Or will you not goe with us to Heaven? I pray return to us in *time*, rather than *wish* you had done it when 'tis too *late*.

* See Bishop *Hall's peace-maker Sect.* 7. *p.* 58.

† See Dr. *Ham. of Schism. ch.* 11. *p.* 178, 181.

They are obnoxious to men of all sides for their sin of Schism;

6. You cannot charge *any* sort of men for having separated from *you*, without incurring the *same* charge, for having separated from *us*: When Mr. *Cawdry* writ against *Independen-*

cy,

67, and gave it the Title of *A great Schism*, I could not but smile at the *retortion* which Dr. *Owen* very speedily and *justly* made him. Nay it is publickly *declared* by a great Body of *congregationals*, * That *they did not break from the Presbyterians, but the Presbyterians rather from them.* You are so far from *agreeing* with *one another*, that you can never be expected to be at *unity* with *your selves*, unless by being *reconcil'd* to the *Church of England*, whose Calamities have *obscur'd*, but not *destroyed* Her. The sin of *Schism* is contracted (saith the Judicious Dr. *Hammond*) *either by some irregularity of Actions, contrary to the standing Rule and Canons of this Church; or by Disobedience to some commands of Ecclesiastical Superiours.* And then by *whom* it is contracted I need not tell you. But, *Blessed be God* (as he goes on p.179.) *the Church of* England *is not invisible: It is still preserved in Bishops and Presbyters rightly ordained, and multitudes rightly baptized, none of which have fallen off from their profession.*

* *Pref.* p.13.

loco supra citato.

7. To your preposterous Demands then, *why we separate from you, and refuse to go to your Communion*, the first and shortest Answer is this, that we are passively *separated*, because you *actively* are *separatists*. We, by *remaining* as we were, are *parted* from you; and you, by your *violent departure*, have made our Difference unavoidable. We are divided by *necessity*, and you by *choice*; we from *you* our *Dividers*, but you from *us*, and between *your selves*. You (like *Demas*) having *forsaken us*, and having *embraced this present world*, it is our lot (as it was *Paul's*) to be unavoidably *forsaken*. It is God's own Method, to *turn away* from his *Deserters*. When the Times are *changed* by some, and others are *changed* by the Times, you must at least excuse (if not commend) us, that *we* * *meddle not with those who are given to change*. For you to *go from* us, and then to chide us for being *parted*, is the greatest injustice to be imagin'd; because it requires us to *verifie* the *two Extremes* of a *contradiction*. A second Answer I shall give you in better words than *mine own*; even the *same* which Dr. *Hammond* once gave the *Papists*;

Especially to the Episcopal, whose sufferings have made them the more conformable to the primitive Christians.

* *Prov.* 24. 21.

See Dr. Hammond of Schism, p. 180, 181.

*** "The Night-meetings of *primitive Christians in* "*Dens* and *Caves*, are as pertinent to the justifying of *our* "Condition as they can be of any; and 'tis certain that *the* "*forsaking of the Assemblies*, Heb. 10. 25. is not *excusing* "*our wilful fault*, (v. 26.) but onely our *unhappy Lot*; who "are forced either not to frequent the *Assemblies*, or else "to *incourage* (and incur the *scandal* of seeming to *approve*) "the *practises* of those that have *departed* from the *Church*. "That we do not decline *Order*, or *publick communion*, and "consequently are not to be charged for not *enjoying* those "*Benefits* of it, which we vehemently *thirst* after, is evident "by the *extensive* Nature of our *persecution*; the same "Tempest having with *us* thrown out all *Order* and *Form*, "*Bishops* and *Liturgy* together. And to that *Curstnesse* of "theirs, not to any *Obstinateness* or *Unreconcileableness* of "ours, (which alone were the *guilt* of *non-Communion*) is "all that *unhappiness* of the *constant Sons* of the *present Eng-* "*lish Church* to be imputed.

Lay-elders condemned by such as had sworn to assert them.

Sect. 30. I am glad to find you *thinking*, *that unordainted Elders wanting power to preach, or administer the Sacraments, are not Officers in the Church of God's Appointment: and that as far as you can understand, the greater part, if not three parts for one of the English Ministers that we stand at a distance from, are of this mind, and so far against Lay-Elders as well as we; of whom you confess your self one, and Mr.* Vines *another*, p. 4. But I am not glad to find you *excusing* what you *condemn*. 'Tis true, ye all *swore* (when ye took the Covenant) *to preserve the Discipline and Government in the Church of* Scotland, *and to reforme the Church of* England *in Discipline and Government according to the example of the best Reformed Churches*, (of which the *Scotish* was implied to be the *chief*) yea *to bring the Churches in the three Kingdoms to the neareſt conjunction and Uniformity in Church-government, &c. Lay-elders* in *Scotland* were pretended to be by *Divine right*. The Platforme of *Geneva* was highly magnified (that I say not *blasphemously*) for *the Pattern shew'd in the Mount*. The *Scepter of Christ*, and *Evangelium Regni Dei*, were noted expressions of their *Device*.

But

But since you have printed your own opinion, that there were no such Lay-elders of God's appointment, you should rather have *recanted* your having sworn the *Scotish Covenant*, than have tryed by all means to make the best of so bad a matter. Whilst you believe a *fourth part* of the *Presbyterians* are directly against the *other three*, in thinking *Lay-elders of God's appointment*, you give us to hope that *your Kingdom will never stand*. And indeed if you will read but the *first* 5. *Chapters of Bishop* Bancrofts *Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline*, you will find that no *Sect* hath been more *divided against it self*. See what is said by Dr. *Gauden* (in his excellent * *Dendrologia*) concerning *the Pertness and Impertinency, the Arrogancy and Emptiness, the Juvenility and Incompetency, the Rusticity and Insolency of some Ruling and Teaching Elders too*; the *disagreement that was found betwixt High-shoes and the Scepter of Church-government*: especially mark what he † saith of *the Decoy and Fallacy, the Sophistry and Shooing-horn of bringing in Lay-elders by Divine Right*; and perhaps when you have done, you will hardly *excuse* your own *Excuses*; much less the *manner* in which you make them, for to excuse the *Lay-elders* as men *not preaching*.

* p. 17.

† p. 18.

*Sect.*31. You say, *In that, our Readers are much like them*, p.4. And again you speak of our *Ignorant, Drunken, Worldly Readers, and Lazy Preachers, that once a day would preach against doing too much to be saved*, p.16.] But 1. that any have *so preached*, of the regular Clergy, is your *ungrounded Intimation*, for which you are answerable to God. They have commonly been accused of having preached *for* the doing too much to be saved. Their earnest pressing for the Necessity of *Universal Obedience* to the *Law* of *Christ*, which carries along with it all manner of *good works*, hath very frequently procured them the name of *Papists, Socinians, Pelagians, Moralists*, any thing in the world to express the dislike of your *Presbyterians*. The *Antinomians* are the chief men, who preach *against* doing too much to be saved; and as the Fautors of that Heresie, you your self have accused both Mr. *Pemble* and Dr. *Twisse*, who were

A Calumny cast upon our Preachers to the sole disgrace of the Calumniator.

not *Prelatists* but *Presbyterians*. And such were *they* who applauded *The Marrow of modern Divinity*, which you have sharply written against for the like dangerous positions. Nay you your self are more liable to undergo your *own censure*, than any Prelatist I ever heard of, for teaching the people how great a *wickedness* may well *consist* with their being *Godly*. Of this I have given so many Examples, that I shall adde but one more: You put the Question, *Whether if men live many years in swearing or the like sin, it is not a certain sign of ungodliness?* To which you answer in these words, *A godly man may long be guilty of them, as 'tis known, some well-reputed for Godliness are in* Scotland. *Reputation doth much with many even that are godly, to make sin seem great or small. With us now a swearer is reputed so great a sinner, that he is reckon'd with Adulterers and Drunkards. But Censoriousness, Backbiteing, Church-division, Disobeying those that rule over us in the Lord,* (I pray let that be remembred) *spiritual pride, &c. which are greater sins than swearing, do not so brand a man, nor make him odious with us.* This again deserves your notice.

See Disp. of right to Sacram. 3. p. 330.

2. That *Preaching* once a day, and once a day *Catechizing*, is better than *prating twice a day* (without either *Preaching* or *Catechizing*) will be granted by all, who shall consider the meek saying of the most eminent Preacher, Bishop *Andrews*, *that when he Preached twice a day, he prated once.* And what dishonour hath been done both to God, and his Church, by turning the whole publick worship into *two Sermons upon a Sunday*, you may collect at your leisure from Mr. *Thorndike*. It is a proverbial observation, that *two* Sermons (of the new mode) do seldome differ more from *one*, (excepting the labour of lips and lungs) than *two* distinct *sixpenses* from *one whole shilling*. And though (since the departure of my assistant) I have also preached twice a day, yet I think not the better of my performance.

Once a day preaching and Catechizing, a great deal better than prateing twice.

3. Your *lazy Preachers* are they who will not take the paines to *meditate*; and onely make up in the *number* of their Sermons, what their hearers would rather receive in *weight*

The Accuser most criminal.

weight. That you your self sometimes are a * *lazy Preacher*, you have publickly confessed in your *odd sheet for the Ministery*. Which make's it the more unseemly for you, to be an accuser of your brethren.

* *Our sheet for the Ministery*, p. 14.

4. And as unseemly for you it is, to upbraid them so much with their being *Readers*. For the notorious *Readers* of their *Sermons* are the eminent men of *your way*. I do esteem Dr. *Reynolds* as the most learned and the most eloquent of all your Preachers. Nor do I value him the *less* for being a *Reader*, but rather the *more* for his resolution to preach no more than he can *write*. Not to tell you of Mr. *Manton*, and all the rest of that party, let it suffice that Mr. *Hickman* is observ'd to be one of your *lazy Readers*. And if he *preacheth*, as he hath *printed*, the printed *language* and *matter* of *English* * *writers* (not onely not acknowledging, but) *defaming* and *reviling* the severall *owners*, it is not an honour to your party, that he is one of your chief men. Nay since you told us from the Press, that † *you use notes as much as any man*, I and others have thought you a *Reading-preacher*. And so you see your misfortune in this *other* part of your *accusation*. There are *twenty* Readers of *your* way, for *one* of *ours*.

The Presbyterian Readers are many more than the Episcopal,

* Dr. Heylin. Mr. Goodwin. Mr. Morrice. Mr. Prinn, &c.

† *ubi supra*, p. 13.

5. Because you are not afraid to add, [*That in abundance of our most applauded Preachers, the things of God were spoken with so little life, and seriousness, as if they had not been believed by the Speaker, or came not from the heart*, (p. 17, 18.) I must put you in mind of that *publick Penance*, which both your *Person* and *Party* were condemn'd to do in your *Saints rest*. Where (and to speak one syllable from common fame, or from known experience,) when you had reckon'd up many and great faults in the dispensation of the word, you shut up the *Bill* with these expressions, [*the Lord pardon the great sin of the Ministery in this thing, and in particular mine own.*] And what were those aggravations which made your sin so exceeding sinfull? Even as many as you had mustered in *several pages* going before. Such as——

And their preaching much worse, if we may credit their own Confessions.

Saints Rest. part 3. Sect. 5. p. 99.

"*your seldom sitting your Sermons, either for matter or manner*
"*to the great end, your people's Salvation, your Sacrificing*

* *Ibid. p. 98, 99.*

"*your studies to your own credit, or your peoples content, or some*
"*such base inferiour end, your formal frozen lifeless Ser-*
"*mons, your handling sins gently, your tender dealing with*
"*careless hearts, your telling the people of Heaven and Hell*
"*in such a sleepy tone and slighty way, as if you were but act-*
"*ing a part in a Play. In a word, your want of serious-*
"*ness about the things of heaven, which charmes the Soules*
"*of men into formality, and that brought them to that custo-*
"*mary careless hearing which undoe's them.*] With these and many other things you charge your *brethren* in *general*, as well as *your self* in a *peculiar* manner. So very ill were you advis'd in your *indefinite accusation* of our *Episcopal Divines*, for being guilty of but *one* of those *many* faults, which you discover in *your self*, and your *Presbyterians*.

An agreement in point of Railing between the Quakers and Presbyterians.

6. That Ternary of Epithets which you disgorge against the Prelatists. [*Ignorant, Drunken, Worldly*,] I shall onely leave you to *lick up* again at your leisure, and intreate you, for the future, to leave your railing. The *Quakers* may thank you for joyning with them, in bringing the *Priesthood* into *disgrace*. But sure you will not thank the *Quakers*, when they shall rationally demand, [if *some* of the *Prelatists* are so *unworthy*, how extremely much *worse* are the *Presbyterians*?

7. I will shut up this *Section*, concerning *Preachers*, with a certain passage in your *Epistle* before your Treatise of *judgement*. Which though I could not but observe without a *prompter*, yet I should not at present have told you of it, had not *another* observ'd it, as well as I; and also taken it so unkindly, that you should *Court* the rich *Citizens*, whilst you seem to *contemn* the poorer Inhabitants of the *Country*, as to desire I would give you some *Item* of it. Your words I allude to are briefly these. * [*Let us in the Country have the honest rain young Preachers, and see that you have chief Fathers, and Pillars in the Church.*] An honest *Husbandman* in my Parish was much offended at this expression. And having ruminated upon it, took occasion to tell me his *Meditations*. He thought the *Soules* in *all Countries*

* Epist. Dedic. p. 10.

tries (within *this Island*) were both as *many* and as *pretious* as those at *London*, and every way as *dear to God*. He thought it as much pity, for *young Preachers* to be *raw*, as for *old* ones to be *rotten*. He could not but put the Question, (if I may help express his mind) in which of those *two ranks* Mr. *Baxter* did reckon *himself* to be. If he thought *himself* one of the *raw young Preachers*, why did he take upon him to *censure* the eminentst Preachers in the Church? If he thought himself *a Father and Pillar in it*, why did he give so gross a *Hint*, that he would fain be sent for up to *London*? He doth *not deserve* a Country Pulpit, who thinks himself *too good* for it. Besides, the right Reverend *Bishops* are the *chief Fathers, and Pillars of the Church*, of which the *Diœces* of *London* can have but *one*. And so the *plain Country-man* doth no exactly understand you.

A fair Confession how far a Protestant may go and be still a Protestant.

Sect. 32. Whilst you say that some *Protestants, as* Bishop *Bramhall and many more, do hold the Pope may be obeyed by the Transmarine Western Churches as the Patriarch of the West, and be taken by us all to be the Principium unitatis to the Catholick Church, and the Roman determinations still may stand, except those of the last* 400. *yeares, and those, if they obtrude them not on others*, (p.7.) You help your Reader to conclude, that *Grotius* might well have been a *Protestant* by the very *allowance* of his *accuser*. And supposing my Reader to be *intelligent*, I shall make no other use of your large *Concession*.

Of Bishops and Presbytery.

Sect. 33. You very confidently say, *that in the pulished judgments of* Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Usher*, Dr. *Holdsworth*, *Forbes, and others, they would have all Presbyters to be Governours of the Churches, one of them having a stated Presidency or Moderatorship, and this will content them.* p.9.] I know not what they have declared in other parts of their writings, which I have never yet seen. Nor am I sure I know your *meaning* (by the word *Presbyters*, *Presidency*, *and Governours of the Churches*,) much less am I sure that you *your self* do know *theirs*. But I know what Bishop *Hall* hath done and *suffer'd* for that *Episcopacy*, which had been established in this land with *Christianity it self*, and had also

also been confirmed by 32. *Acts of Parlament*, (nor need I tell you how much an *Act* doth differ from an *Ordinance*,) and was abundantly provided for by *Magna Charta*, which by statute is* declared the *Common Law of the land*. I say, I know what he hath *done* against the *many-headed Smectymnuus*, in which are compendiously represented the chiefest sticklers for the *Presbytery*, as Dr. *Gauden* hath expressed in that *crooked low shrub*, which ambitiously supplanted the *well-grown Cedar*. Again I know what he hath *suffered* by his imprisonment in the *Tower*, where yet the *reason* of his imprisonment made it a *comfortable restraint*. I farther know what he was for, when he writ his *Peace-maker*, to wit the *Primitive Government universally agreed upon by all antiquity*, for which he refers you to the writings of *Clemens*, and *Ignatius*. He makes use of the Confessions both of *Camero*, and *Beza*, of *Marlorate*, and *Calvin*, that in a *very City* there was chosen *one Bishop*, least an *equality* in the Clergy should *engender strife*. That the *Bishop was indeed the very* b *Prince of the Clergy*. That he was *above the Presbyters* in point of c *order*. That being chosen by the *Colledge* of the *Presbyters*, *he was to be their President*, *and that not without some* d *Authority over the rest*. Now though the *Bishop* doth consent, that he be call'd a *Moderator*, a President, a *Superintendent*, an *Overseer*, or by any other such name, if the *name of a Bishop* is displeasing, (as thinking it pity that *words* should *break square* where the *things* are *agreed*,) yet, saith he, *for the fixedness, or change of this person, let the antient and universal practice of God's Church be thought worthy to oversway*. And he had said a little * before, that the *President* must be *constant*, as well as *one*. Now had you *sworn*, in taking the *Scotish Covenant*, to change the *name* of a *Bishop*, and there had stopt, you might have cited the *Peace-maker* with much more reason than now you do. But you swore to *endeavour the extirpation of* the *thing*, of *Church-Government it self*, by law establish'd. For that you might not be mistaken, you explain'd the word *Prelacy* by the word *Church-Government*, &c. by a good token, that in conclusion, you *superstitiously*

* 25. of Edw. 1. ch. 1, 2.

See Bishop Hall's Peace-maker, p. 48, 49, &c.

a Calvin Inst. l. 4. c. 4.

b Marlorat. in Apoc. 2.

c Beza de Grad. Minist. Evang.

d J. Camer. Myrothec. in Tim 4. 14.

Bishop Hall, p. 50.

* p. 48.

pertinaciously held it for *Anchristian*. And because you often take the confidence to cite that Treatise of Bishop *Hall*, as if it had yielded you some *fig-leaves* to cover the *shame* of your undertakings, I pray observe your concernments in his *Epistle* before the book. I will but put you in mind, *when* the Book was first printed, (to wit in the year 1647.) and who were the very *first* men who did *quieta movere*, and then I will give you his Golden Paragraph.

Bishop *Hall's* censure of the Disturbers of settled Government in the Church.

"It is *felony* by our Municipal Lawes for a man to burn "but the *frame* of a Building *intended* for an house; how "*hainously flagitious* shall the God of heaven account it, "to set fire on his *complete spiritualll House, the Church*, "*whereof every* believer is a living stone? Doubtless how "slight soever the world mak's of these *spiritual distempers*, "it shall be *easier in the day of judgement for Theeves, and* "*Whoremongers, and Adulterers, then for the breakers of* "*publick Peace*. Never was there any so fearfull venge-"ance inflicted upon any *Malefactors, as upon Corah and* "*his Combination*. Surely if we consider the sin it self, o-"ther offenses had been far more hainous; but in that it "was a *presumptuous mutiny, tending to the affront of allow-*"*ed Authority*, to the *violation of Peace*, and to the *de-*"*struction* of *community*, the earth could not stand under "it, hell only is fit to receive it.

Now (Sir) consider with your self, both *what* you have *done* in these times, and with what *success*. You did not open your mouthes wider against *Moses* and *Aaron*, (pretending they had *taken too much upon them*,) than all the people of the earth have open'd *their's* against *you*: Presbytery (like *Corah*) was *swallow'd up quick*. If the Bishops you were *against*, did differ so little as you pretend, from those very Bishops which you are *for*, why was the *publick peace broken* for *private interesses* and *ends*? Let me tell you in the words of the right Reverend Bishop *Hall*, that you and others of your way, who were *born* and *bred under Authority*, [*should have contented your selves to be Disciples rather than Judges, and have entertained reverent thoughts of those that were set over you; not more for the Gravity and Wis-*

* ubi supra, p. 93, 94.

Wisdom of their persons, then for the Authority of their Places. Even Timothie's youth may not be contemned. ——— *Hereupon it was that holier antiquity (even from the daies of great and gracious Constantine)* thought *it very conducible to the good success of the Gospel, to put* respects of honour upon the sacred Messengers of God. ——— *It is too true an observation of* Damasus, *where the name of Church-Governours is grown contemptible, the whole state of the Church must needs be perturbed.*] Could you expect any thing less from the common people, than that they should pay you in your own Coin, and say *yee took too much upon you, and that all the Congregation* was at least *as holy as themselves?* Had your *spiritnall Superiours* been more *venerable* in *yours*, yee had not certainly been so *vile* in the *Peoples* eyes.

Damas. Epist. de Chorepiscopis.

2. Next for his *Grace* of *Armagh*, (whom I can never find you calling by a higher Title then Bishop *Usher*,) I shall but *mind* you how he hath pleaded for the *Prelacy of England* in *other* workes; and onely recite his words at length out of that very piece, in which you seem to have taken the greatest pleasure. For even *there* he hath concluded your *Ordinations by Presbyters to be invalid*, in as much as they were made, where *Bishops might have been had*; there being nothing but *necessity* (in case Bishops *cannot* be had) which in the judgement of the Primate can make such valid. And that you may not flatter your self, his *Grace* intended *such* a *necessity*, as against all reason you sometimes offer to *pretend*, you shall read him subjoyning these following words.

Th Lord Primate's censure of Presbyterian Ordinations, as Invalid, and Schismaticall. Published by Dr. B. p. 125. 126.

"Holding as I do, that a *Bishop* hath Superiority in de-
"gree above a *Presbyter*, you may easily judge that the
"*ordination made by such Presbyters* as have *severed them-*
"*selves* from those *Bishops* unto whom they had *sworn Cano-*
"*nical obedience*, cannot possibly by me be excused from be-
"ing *Schismaticall.*]

You see *what necessity* the Primate admitted for an excuse, and in what respect you are *unexcusable*. For, besides that you are not under *any necessity* of ordaining Presbyters *without a Bishop*; no *necessity* can happen, but what will be

of

of your own *making*; and such an *home-made* necessity will but *aggravate* the wickedness of them that made it. I make no doubt but you will say the same thing, if a power succeeding shall deal with *you*, and your *Function*, as *you* have dealt with your *Superiours*. I shall not add more of the Primate *now*, than that *the Reduction of Episcopacy* is a posthumous work, and yet pretend's to no other modell than what may stand with the preeminence both of *Bishops* and *Archbishops*.

3. Dr. *Holdsworth's Judgement* is as well known, as what he *suffered* for his judgement, during the memorable Reign of the *Presbyterians*. Which puts me in mind of what was said by that learned Gentleman Mr. *Morrice*, ——— * *the digladiations about Discipline have laid open Doctrin to those destructive wounds it bleed's under; the discountenancing and depressing of so many learned Champions of the truth, hath been the leaving* [the Church] *without a Guard*. When you were *swearing* and *fighting* to level the *Bishops* with the *ground*, for want of merit and sufficiency to seat your selves among the *Bishops*, you had not the patience to consider, or not the prudence to believe, that you were laying out your strength (as blinded *Sampson* did *his*) to pull down a *house upon your heads* by laying your *hands* upon its *Pillars*. But now you are taught by sad experience, that what you covenanted against was even the *glory* and *support* of your own profession, you will I hope be so *just* as to blame *yourselves*, if you shall live to *suffer*, as heavy things as you have *done*.

Dr. *Holdsworth's sufferings a declaration of his judgement.*

* *The New-inclosures broken down*. Sect. 21. p. 212.

Judg. 16. 29.

Sect. 34. Whereas you say in your excuse, that some of your party did *not swear* obedience to the Bishops, or did not *disobey such Bishops as* Bishop *Usher assureth us were the Bishops of the Antient Churches*, and that the *Schism is not such, as makes men uncapable of our Communion*, and that since Bishop *Prideaux dyed, there hath been none in his place*, (p. 12. 13.) I briefly answer, first that you speak *against your knowledge*, unless you know not what you *did*, when admitted into the Priesthood. And that I may not repeat two or three pages of what I have said in another book,

The Presbyterian excuses are aggravations of their offences

book, I refer you for a sight of your *great* and manifold obligations *to obey your Ordinary with reverence, and other chief Ministers unto whom the Government and Charge was committed over you*; to acknowledge the *order of our Church* (as then it stood) to be *according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ*, to approve of *Bishops* and *Archbishops, to use the Common prayer*, to observe the *Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church*, and all *according to the Lawes of this Realm*, I say I refer you for a sight of your great and manifold obligations, to my *Βαυτοσλιμπάμβανον ch. 2. p. 51. 52, 53.* Next I must mind you that the Lord *Primate* did onely speak of Communion with the Transmarine Protestans in *France* and *Holland*, upon this supposition, that he were in *those Countries*. But our English Presbyterians were under another consideration. He never received the *blessed Sacrament* at any *one* of *your hands*, nor would he ever hold Communion with any *one* of your *Revolting Scotizing Churches*. But if you return to *our Communion*, from which you fell *by transgression*, both our *Armes* and our *hearts* are alwaies open to *receive* you. And that you may do it so much the sooner, let me admonish you of the *disorder*, which the Lord *Primate wonder'd at in your late Presbyterian ordinations*. A disorder so great, that it sufficeth of it self (without your other *imperfections*, to say no harder things of them,) to make a *nullity* in the things that you most confide in. * [*To give the Seal of Ordination* (as some are pleas'd to call *imposition of Hands*) *without any express* Commission *annexed*, or Grant *of* Authority *to the person, the Primate was wont to say, seemed to him to be like* the putting of a Seal to a blanck.] Your Presbyterian Ordinations he judg'd no better: and the reasons of it at large you may find in those pages which I have cast into the Margin. What *Bishops* there were in the *Antient Churches*, or what the *Primate thought* of them, it matter's not. Your disobedience was not the better, for being acted against those to whom you had *promis'd* to yield *obedience*. And those *alone* are the *Bishops*, which here tis pertinent to speak of, for they *alone* were the Bishops, to whom the men

* See *the Primates judgement of Ordinat. by Pres. set out by* Dr. *Bern. p.* 136. 137, 138, 139.

men of this Age had *sworn Canonical obedience*, through the *Non-performance* of which *obedience*, you had extorted from the Lord *Primate* that *heavy censure*. If, since the Death of Bishop *Prideaux*, none hath succeeded in his *place*, remember what I said lately of *self-created necessity*; and do not imagin your Sin is *lessen'd* by a principall part of its *aggravation*. Add to this, that there are *Bishops*, though not perhaps in your *County*. And where Bishops are to be *had*, you were forbid by the *Primate* to ordain *without* them.

Sect. 35. Whereas you say of Bishop *Prideaux*, [*that he was one of the Antient and moderate sort*. p.13] I heartily thank you for the *Confession*, than which, I could not have wish'd you had made a greater. For *he* was undoubtedly one of *them*, whom you covenanted *against*, and under whom you should have lived in due *obedience*. How much he abhorred your *Scottish-Covenant*, and all your Covenanted *attempts*, especially those against your *Bishops*; how severely he *censured* the *Smectym nan* saw cines, and ambition; how zealously he asserted the established Government of the Church by *Archbishops*, and *Bishops*, *Deanes*, and *Chapters*, *&c*. How very *heavily* he sate upon the skirts of the *Presbyterians*, both for their *Schism*, and *Sacriledg*, and immoderate *railing* against their *Bishops*; and how by these very *courses* he thought them *assisting* unto the *Jesuites* in bringing an *odium* and disgrace upon the *Protestant Religion*, and *Rome* at last into *Britain*; I pray be pleas'd to see at large in his remarkable expressions which now ensue.

Bishop *Prideaux confessed a moderate man, though the sharpest Censor of our English Presbyterians.* See his Fascic. Controv. Epist. Ded.

Rapaces Lupi *non tantùm irruunt ex vicinis* spelæis, *sed ebullunt ex* nobis ipsis, λαλοῦντες διεστραμμένα τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι τοὺς μαθητὰς ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. *Nostis quis prædixit, & quid nos sentimus.*

1. He doth in print Characterize them by *Ravenous wolves*.

Sub parula cujusdam Quercus tegmine Arbusta nonnulla *olim latitantia, putabant se fuisse impedita, per adumbrantium ramorum stillicidia, ne in altum (quod ambiebant) crescerent; Jovem igitur implorant ut quercus averruncetur. Dictum, Factum; quid sequitur? Ingruunt procellæ brumales,* *solo*

2. By ambitious low shrubbs conspiring against the goodly Oake.

solo penitùs aquantur, succedit æstivale incendium, & stirpitùs exarescunt. Intelligentibus non opus est Oedipo.

3. By a peculant Ape on the House-top.

Simia in tecto prætereuntibus tam diu capita diminuat, donec ipsa ab irritatis tandem deturbetur.

4. By the greedy Dog, and the sacrilegious Bird in the cõmon Fable.

Canis umbra inhians extentiori amittit quam in fauciibus possidebat offam; & notum est, quomodo frustula sacrificii ab aliari direptæ adhæsit prunæ in nidi aquilini & pullitici vivicomburium.

5. By Baltasar and Achan.

Deus noster ignis consumens est. Non impune feret Baltassar *temerata Templi vasa; & lingua aurea è consecratis per* Achan *subducta,* Sacrilegium *in Anathemate maranatha eloquetur.*

6. By the Title Smectymnuan importing a Monster with many Heads.

Atque hic inter cætera mirari subit, cur Episcopi *titulus (quo tamen Salvatorem nostrum insignitum esse legimus) adeò recentioris censuræ* Smectymnuanis *sudes esset in oculis, ut necessariò charactérem* Bestiæ *fronti inustum manifestaret. Num* Cranmeri, Latimeri, Ridlei, *& ejusdem classis symmistæ,* Antichristiani *tandem audiant proxenetæ? Et* Juelli, Whitgifti, *aliorumve ejusdem* Hierarchiæ *scripta aut facta* Antichristianismum *redolent? Quin de* vivis (*utcunq;* conculcatis) *illud spondeam; delectum inter se habeant hi nostri* Demagogi, *& proferant primipilos suos in aciem: accinctiores, valentiores, aut constantiores, contra quoslibet Orthodoxorum hostes, quàm ex eversis* Episcoporum *&* Decanorum *phæris, Duces aut Triarios profectò vix inveniant.*

7. By the Bramble consuming the *Cedar of Lebanon.*

Norunt hoc, qui turmis Protestantium turbatis, se latenter immiscent versutissimi Sinones Loiolitici, *ideoq; nil punctiùs urgent, quàm ut per flammas erumpentes ab hujusmodi* rhamnis *seu cynosbatis,* Cedri Libani *absumantur, quo faciliùs in* Britanniam Roma *redeat.*

8. By Papal and Antichristian Arrogance.

Meminisse olim puero, in depictâ quadam tabulâ, ad nomen [PAPA] *huic Acrosticum legisse;* (P) *Pastorum* (A) *Ambitio* (P) *Peperit* (A) Antichristum. *Quis autem esset* major, *lis erat jamdudum inter Apostolos inchoata, sed determinante Salvatore, nunquam acquieverunt posteri. Dominari volunt omnes, nemo (ut oportet) obtemperare; sic ut tandem fiat hoc non gladio oris, sed ore gladii decidendum problema,* An supremátus PAPALIS habeatur potiùs

ANTICHRISTIANUS quàm PRESBYTERIALIS, aut Enthusiasticus.

Ex quàm modicum Ambitionis fermentum totius Christianæ humilitatis corrumpat massam! ἐυκαίρως *igitur & ἀκαίρως Apostolica ista sunt nobis, & à nobis fratribus inculcanda,* μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προσκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες, *Gal.* 5. *Cavete* canes, *cavete malos operarios, cavete concisionem, Phil.* 3. *Siquidem qui seipsos* segregant *sub cujuscunq; afflatus pretextu,* inflati *tandem* animales, *&* Spiritum Sanctum non habentes *invenientur, Judæ ver.* 19. *Justus etiam distinguet inter vinum vetus & novum (quod jamdudum indicavit Salvator) & certò pronunciabit,* vetus esse utilius, Luke 5.

9. By unclean Separatists and Animals puffed up.

In these several particulars you have partly the *History*, and compleately the *Character* of our late English *Smectymnuans* or *Presbyterians*. And you have it from Bishop *Prideaux*, who *is one of the ancient and moderate sort*. It is at last become a Question (saith Bishop *Prideaux*) not to be otherwise *decided* than by the *Mouth of the Sword*, [Whether *Papal* Supremacy is to be reckoned *Antichristian*, rather than the *Presbyterial* or *Enthusiastical*.] And this he tells you in an *Epistle*, wherein you were *personally* concerned, if you were one of his *Diœces* A. D. 1652. He also tells you in that Epistle, (I pray observe it as from a *Bishop* who is both of the *Ancient* and *moderate sort*,) That *Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline in every well-ordered Church, are Alwaies and by All to be looked upon with a Religious eye*. That the first is contained in the 39 *Articles*, the second in the *Liturgy* and Liturgick Monuments, the third in the *Canons* and Constitutions of the Church: which being *piously*, and *providently*, and *prudently consigned and delivered down to us from the purest fountains of Antiquity*, and in *especial manner by the Reformed Bishops*, He thought it his duty to *defend* in the several *Controversies* and *Questions* which there ensue.

Ista premunt, expendunt, defendunt Insequentia ζηλώματα.

2. I pray, Sir, think on these things, and one thing more, that neither his *Piety*, nor his *Learning*, nor his approved *Industry*, nor yet the Reverence of his *Years*, no nor

Bishop Prideaux us'd worse than any scandalous Minister I ever heard of.

nor his being of the *Ancient and moderate sort*, could prevail for a protection from being *banished from his Books*, and *sequestred from his studies*, and presbyterianly *despoiled* of that *subsistence*, which by *God's* and *Man's Law* was undisputably his *own*. Many *scandalous* Ministers have been *preserv'd* by *your party*, and many too have been *exalted* into the *best* mens Rights by wrong and violence. But Bishop *Prideaux*, and Bishop *Hall*, and Dr. *Holdsworth*, and Dr. *Hammond*, and whatsoever was most conspicuous for heighth of *Piety* or depth of *Learning*, (of which sort it were easie to name some *hundreds*) were all exposed by the Presbyterians (at least as far as in them lay) to the utmost extremities of want and beggery, without the least Mercy or Moderation. Had they been *Heapers up of Riches* (as *Presbyterians* and *Jews* are observed generally to be) you might have squeez'd them as *sponges* without much *harm*. And if the men of *your party* (upon the present shifting the *scene* of things) shall be forc'd to *feel* what they *inflicted*, (as some have presaged whilst they were reading your two *Dedicatory Epistles*, wherein you are subscribed a *Faithful Subject*, and wherein you complain of the * *Democratical Polititians, who were busie about the change of Government,*) they will feel it so much the *less*, by how much the greater the *Treasures* are, which their Avarice and Rapine have *raked up* for them against their *Winter*.

* Epist. Ded. before Key for Cath. p 10.

A Vindication of Bishops and D. Hammond's *Paraphrase.*

Sect. 36. Your *principal* Argument against our *Bishops*, by law established in *England*, which you urge from *Scripture* and Dr. *Hammond's Paraphrase* (from p. 2010 to p. 127.) I do the rather think *fit* for *my* consideration, because I think it *not fit* at all, that so *learned* a person as Doctor *Hammond* should ever take it into his *own*. Its pity a Person of his employments should descend to a taske of so little moment. And whilst *he* is doing those things, which cannot be done but by himself, let me have leave to do *that*, for which your Argument's *inability* hath made me *able*.

You know the summe of it is this; that *Preaching*, *Confirming*,

firming, Discipline, Care of the poor, Visiting the Sick, Baptizing, Congregating the Assemblies, Administring the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, guiding the Assemblies, Blessing the people, Absolving the Penitent, and more then these (p.27.) *are the works of the Antient Episcopall Function. But no one man can now performe all these to so many hundreds of Parishes as are in one Diœcess; Ergo our Diœcesan Bishop is not the same with the Antient Bishop.*

This being the summe of your chiefest Argument, may be enlarged (by my consent) in the *Major Proposition*, to the utmost pitch of advantage, to which your *own heart* can wish the difficulty improved; to wit by urging that the Bishops were at first invested by the Apostles, with *all manner* of *Ecclesiasticall* both *Power* and *Office*. And so the *Bishop* in every *Diœcesse*, being lineally the *successor* of that *numerical Bishop* who was *ordained* by the Apostles, is by consequence invested with *all this* power. From whence there flow's *another Sequel* as unavoidable as the former, that not the *least part* of this Sacred *power* can be possibly received but from the *Bishop*.

3. All which being *granted* as very *true*, and my thanks being returned for your *service* to the *truth* whilst you *resist it*, (for *Presbyterian Ordinations* are hence evinced to be *null*,) I shew you the vanity of your *Minor* by putting you in mind of a plain *distinction*, [*per se, aut per alium, mediatè, vel immediatè*,] your meer *forgetfullness* of which (for *ignorant* of it you could not be) made you imagin there was a *force* where you will speedily acknowledge there can be *none*. For what a *Bishop* is not able to do *by himself*, he may very well do by the *help of others*, (τὰ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων δι' ἡμῶν πως ἐστι.) There is nothing more obvious, then that when *Moses* is * overtask'd, he should take in *others* in *partem Curæ*, and yet lose nothing of his *Preeminence*. And even for this very reason had the Bishops *all power*, as well as power to *communicate* it either in *whole*, or in *part*, that what they could not perform *alone*, they might by *Proxy*, whether by *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, *Subdeacons*, *Arch-Deacons*, *Chancellors*, *Officials*, (I will add

* *Exod.* 18. 18, 22, 26.

Church-

Church-Wardens, and *Overseers* of the *Poor*,) what is done by their *Delegates* is done by *them*.

4. Now that this was the case in the earliest times of the Church, our learned and Reverend Dr. *Hammond* hath irresistibly * evinced. And had you first been well acquainted with his four *Latin dissertations*, you had not stumbled at the *light* of his *English Paraphrase*. † Clemens Romanus would have told you, that in the *Regions* and *Cityes* where the *Apostles had preached* and gathered Churches, they *constituted Bishops* to Rule those Churches, and likewise *Deacons* to be subservient to those Bishops. Why *no Presbyters* as yet, *Epiphanius* would have inform'd you out of the *oldest Records*. For *whilst there was not* (saith he) *so great a* * *multitude of believers, as to need the ordaining of any Presbyters*, (*between* the two above said orders *Bishops* and *Deacons*,) *they contented themselves with the Bishop onely*; who together with his *Deacon*, whom *he could not conveniently be without*, did *then* abundantly suffice for so small a Diocesse. But when believers did so *increase* in the single Diocesse of a Bishop, as that there needed *more Pastors*, and *fit* men were *to be had*, then they admitted into the *Priesthood* (I do not say into the *Prelacy*) that other sort of *Church-Officers* whom we now call *Presbyters*. And I conceive that *such Presbyters* were ordained in *Asia* by St. *John*, because *Ignatius* (in *Trajan's* time) throughout his Epistles to those Churches of *Asia*, doth distinctly make mention of *all three orders*. If then the *Primitive Bishops* did thus communicate of his *power* to *Inferiour Pastors*, and still reserve unto himself the *super-intendency* over all, what should hinder their *Successors* from doing according to their *example*? And why should any man presume to take any power unto himself, but he whom the Bishop hath first *ordained* unto the office of a *Deacon*,

* *Consulatur Summ. viri.* Dissert. 4. p. 210, 211.

† Κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες, καθίσανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. *Clem. Rom.*

* Πλήθους δὲ μὴ ὄντος, οὐκ ἐυρέθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καταστῆναι· καὶ ἠρκέσθησαν ἑνὶ τῷ κατὰ τόπον μόνῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, &c. *Epiph. Her. l.* 3. *t.* 1.

(a

(a kind of *secundary Presbyter*,) and after *that*, to a *Cure of soules*, (which belongs to a *Presbyter plenarius*,) and after that too, to the *Episcopal* Office of *Ordination*?

5. Having shew'd you the full agreement betwixt the *Ancient* and *modern* Bishops, I hope you see your *Inadvertency*, and acknowledge the *vanity* of your *Argumentation*. For (1.) In the *Infancy* of the Church, * none were *worthy* to be made *Bishops* in diverse places; and in *such*, the *Apostles* did all *themselves*; at least the place remained vacant † (2.) Where *need requir'd, and worthy persons were to be had*, in such, the Apostles *ordained Bishops*. But (3.) Whilst the Churches were so thin, as that the *Bishops* (with their Deacons) could well discharge the *whole work*, *Epiphanius* tell's us expresly (and that from the eldest of the Church Histories there was not yet a constitution of *single Presbyters*, ὃν ἐυρέθησαν ἐν ἀυτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καλαρθλῶσι, &c. And of this we have the first instance in *James* the Bishop of *Jerusalem*, to whom were added *seven* * *Deacons*, without the least *mention* of any *Presbyters*. Yet (4.) Many *meer Presbyters* were ordained, (not with a priviledge to *ordain*, but to dispense the *Word* and *Sacraments*,) as soon as the *number* of *Believers* had made it *needfull*. And I pray (Sir) forget not to take due notice, that what is spoken by *Epiphanius* is against the *Heretick Aerius*, the very *first Presbyterian* that ever infested the Christian Church.

* Νέν ὄυλος τῦ κηρύγματος —— ὅτι ὐκ ἐυρέθη τις ἄξιος ἐπισκοπῆς, &c. *Epiph. l. 3. s. 1.*

† Ὅτι ὁ λόγος χρεία, ὁ ὄντας ἄξιοι ἐπισκοπῆς, κατεσάθησαν ἐπίσκοποι. *Id. Ibid.*

* διὰ τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν *Act. 6. 1, 2, 3, 4.*

6. After the *levity* and *unfruitfullness*, consider the *danger* and *unlawfulness* of this your arguing. It being just as much against *all the Monarchs*, as against any *one Bishop* throughout the world. For 'tis the duty of every *King*, and of every other *supreme Magistrate*, (let his Dominions be never so large) to reward, to punish, and to protect, to deale out Justice to *every subject*, whether *corrective*, or *distributive*, as their merits or offences shall seem to challenge. Now comes a *Disputant* like your self, who first displayes the severall parts of the Magistrate's *Office*; next

he proposeth to consideration, how many *hundreds* of *Parishes*, and how many *Myriads* of *Men* may probably be found in his *Dominions*; and then conceiving it *impossible* that any one Mortal should *know* them *all*, much less be able to perform his several offices to *each*, he presently sends the chief Magistrate his *writ of ease*; and then forsooth in *every Parish*, one or other of his *subjects*, who thinks himself able to be a *Ruler*, must take upon him to play *Rex* within that Territory or Precinct: Never *remembring* or *regarding* the famous *Division* of the *Apostle*, much less his *Precept* with which the division is introduced. *Submit your selves to every ordinance of man for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King, as* * *Supreme, or unto* * *Governours, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well.* 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14, 15. From which words I intreate you to make this pertinent observation, that as a *single supreme Magistrate* may well be qualified and fitted for the largest *Taskes* of the widest *Kingdom*, by all those *Emissaries* and *Envoyes*, who are *deputed* to act by his *Commission*; so (with a greater force of reason) is every *Bishop* in his own *Diocess* very sufficiently enabled for every part of his office to every person, by the assistance of those *Presbyters*, and other officers under *them*, who are [πεμπόμενοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ] *by him sent out* into their several charges.

* εἴτε βασιλεῖ, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, εἴτε ἡγεμόσιν, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις —— ὑποτάγητε.

7. You see how unhappy you have been even in *that* way of *Arguing*, in which you seem to have taken the greatest pleasure; there being less force in it against the Bishop of a *Diocess*, than against *that person* to whom you *dedicated your Book*, and acknowledged your self *a faithfull subject*. May you be *faithfull* to *those Superiours*, who are not onely *permitted*, but *appointed* and *Authorized* to Rule over you in the Lord. You see the people of this Land will no more be *ridden* by your Presbyteries. For though you found amongst them some *patient Beasts* for a while, who lov'd the *novelty* of their *Riders*, (if nothing else,) yet *ridding* them (as you did) with *switch* and *spur*, as soon as you got into the *saddle*, you provoked your

tamest

tamest creatures to reprove the madness *of the Prophet*: Saying implicitly to *your selves* as you did frequently to *them*, (and with every whit as much reason) *remember them which have the rule over you, Heb.* 13.7. That is to say (saith our learned *Paraphrast*) *set before your eyes the Bishops and Governours that have been in your Church, &c. Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves, v.* 17. that is, *be subject unto the Bishops*, as St. * *Chrysostom* and the said *Paraphrast* do well explain it.

* 2 Pet. 2.16.

* See the *Note* of Dr. *Ham.* on *Heb.* 13.7.

A refutation of the prime Argument for Presbyterian Ordinations.

Sect. 37. As this may serve for a *specimen* of your voluminous medlings against our *Bishops*, in which you say little against *them*, which your enemies may not say with *greater* reason against *you*, and with as *much* pretense of reason against the *Ministry it self*, and with much *more* reason against their maintenance by *Tithes*; so it sufficeth for a *specimen* of what you plead in the defence of your *Schismaticall Ordinations* (to use the word of the Lord *Primate*) that I acquaint you with the absurdity of your first and chief Argument. In your *second Dispute of Episcopacy, ch.*7.*p.*199. *l.* 8,9, 10, *&c.* You strive to prove, your *Ordination is by Scripture-Bishops.* (Meaning your titular Ordination without Diocesan Bishops,) whose Episcopal Office you sacrilegiously invaded. And you think you prove it by this sad *Syllogism.*

"*The Scripture-Bishops were the Pastors of particular* "*Churches, having no Presbyters subject to them. Most* "*of our Ordainers are such Pastors: Therefore most of our* "*Ordainers are Scripture-Bishops.*

The *major* of this Syllogism you prove from Dr. *Hammond*, and the *minor* from Mr. *Pierce*. At least you are *confident* that you *prove* it; though I shall prove you prove nothing, except your *forgetfulness of Logick*, and somewhat else to your prejudice, of which anon.

2. First for your *Syllogisme*, by the disposition of the *medium* it appeare's to be in the *second Figure*; and yet (which is wonderfull) it consist's of *three affirmative Propositions*, which the *second Figure* cannot *indure*, any more than the *First* can admit of *three Negatives*. And so again

you are obnoxious to the publick assertion of D. *Kendal*, that *a little more of the university would have done you no harm.*

3. Next to know what you have done, by disputing thus in *figure*, without all *mood*, observe the *Conclusiveness* of your *Syllogism*, by an *other* just *like* it in all respects. Suppose (in the person of *Diogenes*) you were to prove that a *Cock with his Feathers stript from him alive*, is a *Man* as well as *Plato*, though not as able to *teach School*; you may thus argue for *him*, as you have done for *your self*.

" *A man is a living Creature with two feet and without*
" *Feathers- A Cock deplumed (like that of* Diogenes)
" *is such a living Creature: Therefore a Cock deplumed*
" *(like that of* Diogenes*) is a man.*

But then you have taught an *ill Sophistry* against your self. For the plainest person in all your Parish may prove you to be an arrant *Heathen* by the very same *Logick* which you have *err'd by*.

" *An arrant Heathen is an Animal indued with reason*
" Mr. *Baxter is an Animal indued with reason: Therefore*
" Mr. *Baxter is an arrant Heathen.*

The *major* at least must be *as true*, as that which you take from Dr. *Hammond*. The *minor* infinitly *truer*, than that which you take from Mr. *Pierce*. And you know the *conclusion* is undeniable. For if the premises are *true*, *Falshood* cannot flow from them by any *regular* Deduction. And if the Deduction is *irregular*, why is your dealing the very *same*, to prove your *irregular Ordinations* exactly *regular*?

4. Come we now from the *Form*, to the *matter* of your *Syllogism*. Your *major* is proved from the words of Dr. *Hammond*, *that the* * *Title of* Πρεσβύτεροι, *in Scripture times, belonged principally, if not onely to Bishops; there being no evidence that any of the second Order were then instituted.* Which words, (if you observe them) do not deny, but *suppose*, that as soon as any of the *second order* were admitted into the Church, they were immediately subject unto the *First*; that is to say, to the *Scripture-Bishops*; there

* See the whole Annotation on *Act.* 11. 30. *B. p.* 406. *to p.* 409.

there having been given him in Scripture a *twofold power*; first a power of *ordaining* inferiour Presbyters, next of *Governing* or *Ruling* them, when so ordained. Had you but fairly transcribed the Doctor's *whole Period*, you must have added to your Citation these following words, [*though soon after*, even *before the writing of* Ignatius *Epistles*, *there were such instituted in all Churches*:] And had you read unto the end of that excellent *Annotation*, you would have found *Epiphanius* for Bishop *Timothy* his *power* (or jurisdiction) *over Presbyters*, *from* 1 *Tim.* 5. 1, 19. Where whatever the word *Presbyter* may be concluded to import, whether a single *Priest* (in the common notion of the word *Presbyter*) subjected to the *Bishop*, or a *Bishop* subjected to the *Metropolitan*; it equally make's against *you*, that Bishop *Timothy* had power *to rebuke*, and to *receive an Accusation against a Presbyter*, which no *meer* Presbyter can pretend to have over *another*. This would imply a contradiction, to wit, that an *equall* is *not an equall* (because a Ruler and a Judge) to the very same person to whom he is an equall. The same-use is to be made of what is cited from *Theophylact* concerning *Titus*, * to wit *that the κρίσις Judgement, as well as χειροτονία Ordination of so many Bishops was committed to him.* And I pray Sir remember one special *Emphasis*, which evidently lye's on the *Doctor's words*. Which do not run thus, *the Title of Presbyters in Scripture times belonged onely to the Bishops*; but *if not onely*, yet at least *Principally* to *them*. And therefore however the case might be, (whether *onely*, or *not onely*,) all the course of his arguing will be equally *cogent* and *unresistible*.

* *Ibid.*

5. Now for your *minor*, [that *most of your Ordainers are such Pastors*] you prove it by saying, *first they are Pastors*. But this is *petitio principii* with a witnesse, to say *they are*, *because they are*. And tis a gross transition *ab Hypothesi ad Thesin*, to say they are *such* Pastors, because they are *Pastors*. The word *Pastor* in our dayes doe's commonly signify a *Priest*, to whom is committed a *Cure of Soules*. And when I have lately so us'd it, it hath been onely in complyance

plyance with that *vulgar Catachresis*. But in the u seof *Scripture* and *antient Writers*, Pastor signifies *him*, to whom the charge of theFlock is *Originally* intrusted ; whereas our English acception of the word *Rector* (which is not the *Scriptural* or *antient* stile) is wholly extended to a *deputed* or *partiary Government* in the Church, to wit, a Government over *part* of the *Pastors Diocess*, which *Pastor* (in the old stile) hath the *plenary charge* committed to him. Your error therefore was very great, in confounding the *Pastors* with the *Rectors of the people*, unless you spake with the *vulgar* καταχρηστικῶς ; and supposing that so you did, you spake completely *besides the purpose*. And whereas you say in your Margin, [Mr. *T. P. call's himself Rector of Brington.*] I know not what you can mean by it, unless an unkilfull intimation, that I *arrogate* to my self somewhat more then is my due. And therefore to undeceive either *your self*, or your *Readers*, I must tell you that in *all Records* which concern this *Church*, or its *Incumbent*, in all *Leases*, and *Compositions*, and *Judgments of Law*, in all *Directions* and *Orders*, which have ever been sent by Supreme Authority, the *Church* hath been stiled the *Rectory*, and the *Incumbent* the *Rector* of it. You may gather the reason from Mr. *Sparrow's* Learned *Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*. *The chief Rector of a Parish (called the Cardinal Priest of old, quia incardinatus in Beneficio) was* ὁ ἱερεύς, *and the rest under him his Clerks.*------*Where there were Chantries, as there were in most Churches of* England, *their assisting the Rector of the Church made up that Form of speech, the Priest and Clerks.* And *Brington* being a Parish consisting of *five distinct Members* hath occasion'd the *Rector* in all times to be at the charge of an *Assistant*. I have told you what I mean, whensoever I write my self *Rector of Brington*: If Mr. *Cawdrey* hath meant more, when he hath written himself as publickly, *the Rector of Billing*, I leave him to give you a Reason for it.

Having done with your Argument, and with your personall reflection, I shall observe but one thing more ; to wit that

that whilst you say *most* of your Ordainers are such Pastors, as Dr. *Hammond* spake of in Scripture-times, (which yet I hope you will retract) you imply a confession, that *some are not*. Nor can I see by what meanes you will excuse your selves unto your selves, for having admitted of *such Ordainers*. As for your second and third sentences in your *Sect.* 5. *p.* 199. You have an answer included in what went *before*; and so you will have in that which *follows*. For,

Sect. 38. In your *seventh Chapter*, p. 203. Sect. 18. You again pretend to fetch an Argument from the words of the Reverend Dr. *Hammond*. Your naked affirmation is express'd in these words. *Where there are no such Presbyters with a President, it is yet enough to prove him a Bishop, that he hath Deacons under him, or but one Deacon.* Your pretended proof of this assertion is from the words of Doctor *H.* which now ensue. [When the Gospel was first preached by the Apostles, and but few converted, they ordained in every City and Region no more but a Bishop, and one or more Deacons to attend him, there being at the present so small store out of which to take more, and so small need of ordaining more.] Reduce this proofe into a *Syllogisme*, which may serve your interest in any measure, and it will be like your *former*, most dishonourably *false*. For thus you *must* form it, (do what you can) if you intend to make it in *imitation* of a *proof*.

Presbyteriens are not Bishops by having Deacons under them.

A primitive Bishop had no more then a Deacon or Deacons to attend him: A Presbyter hath no more then a Deacon or Deacons to attend him: therefore a Presbyter is a Primitive Bishop.

Here you see are three *affirmatives* in the *second Figure*. And by an Argument so form'd I will prove you to be *any thing* (either Fish, or Fowle,) with which you have any the *least Agreement*. Reduce your proof then (a second time) into a *syllogisme* truly made, and your case will be *alter'd*, but nothing *mended*. Your fall into the *Fire* will indeed be *regular*, but you will get no more by it, than if you continue in the *frying-pan*.

For

For your *truly form'd* Syllogism will be but thus, *whosoever hath none but a Deacon or Deacons to attend him is a Primitive Bishop: A Presbyter hath none but a Deacon or Deacons to attend him: Therefore a Presbyter is a Primitive Bishop.*

Here the *matter* is as untoward, as the *Form* was before. The *Major* proposition being admirably *false*. For though a man may be a *Bishop* who hath *no more*, to attend him, when no more are to be *had*; (and that because *no more* are *needfull*, which is the thing that Dr. *Hammond* hath often taught you) yet his having *no more*, doth not prove him to be a *Bishop*, which was the thing to be proved from Dr. *Hammond*. When *Ignatius* reckons the *Three* Orders, *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, 'tis as impossible for him to meane, that *Priests* are *Bishops*, as that *Deacons* are *Priests*. For though *every Bishop* is a *Priest*, it can no more follow that *every Priest* is a *Bishop*, than it can possibly follow that *every Animal is a man*, because it is true, that *every man is an Animal*. A Primitive *Bishop* and a meer *Presbyter* may have a *Conversion per Accidens*, and another *conversion by Contraposition*, but a *simple conversion* they cannot have. To *say* they can, without *proof*, is but the begging of the Question; which being sure to be *denyed* you, I shall advise you to beg no more.

I will conclude this subject with a remarkable passage of Mr. *Thorndike*. And I will do it so much the rather, because the *weightiness* and the *price* of that excellent Volume may probably keep it from the perusal of vulgar Readers, who onely meddle with the cheapest Bookes.

Mr. *Thorndike's judgement of Presbyt: Ordinations, &c. In his Epilogue to the Tregud. Of the Ch. of Engl.* Concl. P. 408.

" The *Presbyterians*, sometimes pleade their *Ordination* " *in the Church* of England, for the authority by which " they *ordaine others against the Church of England*, to do " that, which they received authority from the Church of " England to do, provided that, according to the order of " it. A thing so *ridiculously senseless*, that common reason " refuseth it. Can any state, any society do an act, by vir- " tue whereof, there shall be right and authority to destroy " it? Can the Ordination of the Church of England, pro-

ceeding

"ceeding upon supposition of a solemn promise, before "God and his Church, to execute the ministry a man re-"ceiveth, *according to the order of it*, inable him to do that "which he was *never ordained* to do? Shall he, by *failing* "of his *promise*, by the act of that power which supposed "his promise, receive *authority* to *destroy* it? Then let a "man obtaine the *Kingdom of Heaven* by *transgressing* "that *Christianity*, by the undertaking whereof he obtain-"ed right to it. They are therefore meer Congregations, "voluntarily constituted, by the will of those, *all whose* "*acts*, even in the sphere of their ministry once received, "are become *voide* by their failing of that promise in "consideration whereof they were promoted to it. Voide "I say, not of the *crime* of *Sacriledge* towards God, which "the *usurpation* of *Core* constituteth, but of the *effect of* "*Grace* towards his people. For, the like voluntary com-"bining of them into *Presbyteries* and *Synodes*, createth "but the same equivocation of words, when they are "called Churches, to signifie that which it visible by their "*usurpation*, in point of *fact*, not that which is invisible, by "their authority, in point of *right*. For want of this au-"thority, whatsoever is done by virtue of that *usurpation* "being voide before God; I will not examine whether "the form, wherein they execute the Offices of the "Church which they think fit to exercise, agree with the "ground and intent of the Church, or not. Onely, I "charge a *peculiar nullity* in their consecrating the Eucha-"rist, by neglecting the Prayer for making the ele-"ments the body and blood of Christ, without which, the "Church never thought it could consecrate the Eucha-"rist. Whether, having *departed from the Church*, Presby-"teries and Congregations scorne to learne any part of "their duty from the Church, least that might seem to "weaken the ground of their departure; or, whether they "intend, that the elements remaine *meer signes*, to streng-"then mens faith, that they are of the number of the *elect*; "which they are, before they be consecrated, as much as "afterwards; the want of consecration rendering it *no*

"*Sacrament* that is ministred, the ministring of it upon a "ground destructive to Christianity, renders it *much* "*more*.

Immoderate virulence towards those of the Episcopal way.

Sect. 39. I now returne to your long *Preface*, from whence I stept into your *book*, that the things of *one Nature* might be consider'd together in *one Head*. That for which I am next to complain of you unto your self, is your immoderate *bitternesse* to the *Episcopal way*, and to the men of *all qualities* who dare to own it. Many *Gusses* of it there are, of which I will here transcribe a few. "* "*We see* "*that most of the ungodly in the land, are the forwardest for* "*your waits. You may have almost all the Drunkards,* "*Blasphemers*, and *Ignorant haters of godliness in the Coun-* "*try, to vote for you, and if they durst, againe to fight for* "*you at any time.* —— *The spirit of prophaneness complyeth* "*with you, and doteth on you, in all places that ever I was* "*acquainted in,* —— * *should one of you now pretend to be* "*the Bishop of a Diocess,* —— *you would have a small Cler-* "*gy and none of the best and the people in most Parishes that* "*are most ignorant, drunken, prophane, unruly, with some* "*civil persons of your mind, &c.* —— * *The cause of their* "*love to Episcopacy is, because it was a shadow (if not a shel-* "*ter) to the Prophane heretofore, and did not trouble them* "*with discipline, and because they troubled and kept under* "*the Puritanes, whom they hated. But if you did not exer-* "*cise Discipline on them, your Churches, would be but the* "*very sinks of all other Churches about you, to receive the* "*filth that they all cast out; and so they would be so great* "*a reproach to Episcopacy, that would make it vile in the* "*eyes of sober men: So that a Prelatical Church would in the* "*common account be near kin to an Alehouse or Tavern (to* "*say no worse.)* — * *So that for my part, were I your ene-* "*my, I would wish you a toleration; but being really a friend* "*to the Church and you, I shall make a better moti-* "*on, &c.*

* *Pref. to Disp. of Church-Gov. p.* 17.

Ibid.

* *Grot. Rel. p.* 113.

* *P.* 114.

* *P.* 135.

Whilst you rail at this rate, not onely *without* but *against* all reason, not onely *beside* but against your own knowledge, (as if it were your *design* to be *voted* for an *ill man*, and

and never more to be *heeded* in what you *say)* you do but shew us your *Doctrin* thus breaking out at your *Fingers ends.* For it is part of your Doctrin, †[*That many professors do rashly rail, and lye in their passions, whom yet you doubt not to be Godly.*] Not considering that a *Railer* is yoked together with an *Idolater*, a *Drunkard*, an *Extortioner*, and the like, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. for it is also your Doctrin *[*that a man may be a Drunkard, and yet have true Grace, and be in the number of the Godly.*] Nay according to your † Doctrin, *Godly* men may be *worse*, even *Murderers, Adulterers, Incestuous persons, Perjur'd, Rebellious, Schismatical, Deniers of Christ*, of which I have shew'd your *own words* in *another place. So as in case it were true, that the men of *our way* are such as you would fain have them, they would be *better* than the *most* of your *Godly men.* But if the *Apostles* had been *alive*, you give us to *guesse* how you would probably have *used* them, by your bitter [illegible]es of those persons, who have not fallen from their *principles*, nor broken their *oaths*, nor receeded from their *subscriptions*, nor *changed* with every turn of Time, nor *invaded* any mans possessions, but have ever made it their choice (with* *Moses)* rather to be on the *suffering*, than on the *persecuting* side. When I and others have been pungent in our expressions of such as *you*, we have said no more than we have *proved* by *undeniable mediums*, and commonly out of your *own writings.* From whence it is we stand *justified* on every side, and *free* from all violation of Christian *Charity* or *Candor.* But *you*, in revenge of such honest dealing, content your self with many naked and groundless *general Affirmations* concerning the men of our way, without so much as an *appearance* of Reason for it. We do approve of a *severe*, but we cannot indure a *false* Accuser, who never considers what is *likely*, much less what is *true*, but giddily throws out the *dictates* of *Pet* and *Rancor.* VVhen our Lord and Master was lying in torment upon the *Crosse*, He was not onely †*railed on by them that passed by*, but even *one of the Malefactors* (who suffered with him on the Cross) did **railingly* vomit up his

† Disp. of right to Sacram. p. 330.

* Ibid p. 319.

† ☞ look back on ch. 3. Sect. 1. & 2. p. 62. 63, 64.

* Eawlorf. c. 3. p. 115.

* Heb. 11. 25.

† Mat. 15. 29.

* Luk. 23. 39.

his gaul against him. Thus you deal with his *Spouse*, and his *younger* † *Brethren*, who have not been *ashamed* of the *Cross of Christ*, which you and others have laid upon them; and who do *pray* for your *persons*, whilst they *reprove* your *wayes*. Nay since the *Downfall* of the *Presbytery*, your self are *one of the Malefactors*, who *justly suffer* with those *Innocents* at whom you *rail*. *Innocents* I mean, as to the *Presbyterian Calumnies*, upon which their sufferings were heaped on them. But there are *some* of your own party whose eyes are opened, and now do *justifie* the Prelatists, whom they had formerly *condemn'd*. These will be ready to * *rebuke you*, (like that *other Malefactor* who was † *hanged* together with our Lord,) and probably bespeake you in these very words. * [*Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we* [Presbyterians] *receive the due reward of our Deedes; but these men* [the Prelatists] *have done nothing amiss.*] I pray consider what you have done, and do so no more if you are wise. Either forbear your *Accusations*, or bring your *Proofes* along with them. For this you know is *my* method; and if you will follow my example in my *Self-Revenger exemplified*, (*ch.* 3. *from p.* 77. *to p.* 85.) Where I *prove*, as well as *accuse*, the Presbyterian *Principles* and *Practise*, (and that from the *chief* of your own Champions) your Accusations will be such as become a Christian.

† *Heb.* 2. 17.

* *Luk.* 23. 40.
† *Verse* 39.
* *Verse* 40. 41.

A parallel case between the Pharisees of old, and our modern Puritanes.

Sect. 40. As in your *Grotian Religion*, so again in this *Preface*, you pleade the cause of the *Puritanes*, and boldly say, *they were taken for men seriously Religious where-e're you came*, and thereupon you run on in your usuall way of defamation, *p.* 18. 19.] But first suppose it were so *indeed*; could it be possibly any fault in all those holy and learned men, who have sharply written against the *Puritanes*, that they did not *erre with the vulgar*, with whom alone *you* were conversant? Tis true, the *Puritanes with the Puritanes* have ever pass'd for *serious Christians*; and you say in effect, that your whole Conversation hath been with *Puritanes*, whilst you say how very highly you have ever found them

them to be reputed. Mark how ill it fare's with you by a parallel case. * Bishop *Hall* hath told you of the *Pharisees*, that they *prayed often and long*; they *read the Decalogue* at least once every day; *the holiness of their carriage was such, as they avoided every thing that might carry any doubt of pollution*; they paid Tithe *even of all*, that is, *of more than they needed*; God would have a Sabbath kept, *and they overkept it.* —— *The poore Jewes* (saith the Bishop) *were so besotted with the Admiration of these two* [The Scribes, and the Pharisees,] *that they would have thought, if but two men must go to Heaven, the one should be a Scribe, the other a Pharisee. It was not the person of these men, nor their learning, nor wit, nor eloquence, nor honour they admired so much, but their righteousness.* — *Herein they seemed to exceed all men. Do but think how the amazed multitude stared upon our Saviour, when they heard this Paradox*, except your righteousnesse exceed the righteousnesse of the Scribes and Pharisees, yee shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. *Exceed the Pharisees in righteousness? It were much for an Angel from Heaven; What shall the poor sons of the earth do, if these Worthies be turn'd away with a repulse?*

* Bishop *Hall* of *Pharisaisme, & Christianity.* p. 373, 374.

Now, Mr. *Baxter*, apply the case. Was our blessed Saviour to be *reviled* as an *Enemy to the Saints*, for pronouncing so many *woes to these Scribes and Pharisees*, and for calling them *Hypocrites, blind guides, Fooles, Serpents, Generation of Vipers?* Was he (I say) to be *reviled*, for setting them out in *these colours*, because (forsooth!) the *Common people* did *think* them *Saints*? Or did our Saviour forbear to acquaint the world with their *Hypocrisies*, for fear their Favourers & Abetters should cal him a *Wine-bibber & a Glutton*, a foe to the Godly, *but a Friend to Publicans & Sinners*? was Bishop *Andrewes* a *slanderous* person, for *preaching* and *writing* against *our Pharisees*, and setting them forth by the name of *Puritanes*, because Mr. *Baxter* is of opinion that the *Puritanes* were *Godly and holy men*? Or dare you say that Dr. *Sanderson* did *play with the Apple of*

Mat. 23. 13, 17, 24, 33.

God's

God's eye, (as you unconscionably word it, p. 19.) When he writ so much against *Puritanes* and *Puritanism*, in that incomparable *Preface* where you are *personally* concerned? yet such as *these* are the men, at whom you *thrust* through my *sides*. Its true that *now* I have largely spoken concerning *Puritanes*. But when you first of all *rail'd* against *Antipuritanes*, I had not written upon the subject, unless it were in a *Citation*, and that by chance. And therefore all your *former bitterness* was poured out against *others*, (of whom I reckon Bishop *Andrews* and Dr. *Sanderson* with the chief) although your *latter evomitions* have partly lighted upon *my self*.

What hath been meant by the word Puritan by learned men.

Sect. 41. You make an excellent Confession, that *in the Universities, and other intelligent Auditories*, the notion of a *Puritane* was so far *understood*, (as I and others do understand it) *that though you have heard before the King many a Sermon against Puritans, which you judged impious, yet it had this excuse, that much of the Auditory partly understood, it was not piety as such, that was directly reviled.* p. 19. But then you add, *that it was not so among the common people through the land; ibid.*

It were worth a man's knowledge, from *whom* you heard those *many Sermons*, which you impiously professe to have judged *impious*. Whether it were from Bishop *Andrews*, who preached more against *Puritanes* than any *Bishop* I ever read; or whether it were from Bishop *Hall*, from Doctor *Sanderson*, or from *whom*. Or whether you *ever heard* a Sermon before the King. I do not think it the liklier, because you say it. The most I have learnt from your writings, is *to beware how I believe you*. For you know where you have told me such things as these —— *that it was safer in all places that ever you knew, for men to live in constant Swearing, Cursing, and Drunkennesse, then to have instructed a man's Family on the Lord's day.* —— Well said Mr. *Baxter*. If you are not *confuted* by your *own sayings* of this kind, you never shall be by my consent.

☞ *Grot. Relig.* p. 109.

But be it so, that the *common people* do understand the word *Puritane* as you would have them; yet give me leave

to

to understand it with the *Universities* you speak of, with Bishop *Andrews*, and Dr. *Sanderson*, and all the rest of those glorious *lights*, whose judgment of *Puritanes* I have elsewhere recited. It is for *us* to *instruct* the seduced people, not to *cherish* them in their *errors*, and *misunderstandings* of Names, or Things. I wish that *all* the *common people* would read that *Preface* of Dr. *Sanderson*, so much commended by all good men; that so they might know the word *Puritane*, as well as *he*. I wish them as knowing in this point, as the Lord Chancellor *Egerton*; who speaking of a *dangerous rebellious Doctrin*, affirmes it never to have been taught, but either by *Traytors*, or by *treasonable Papists*, or by *seditious Puritanes* and *Sectaries*. He gives an instance of the first, in *Spencers Bill in Edward* the *second's* time. Of the second, in *Harding's confutation* of the *Apology*. Of the third, in *Buchanan de jure Regni apud Scotes*, *Penry*, *Knox*, and such like. By these (saith the *Lord Chancellor*) and those that are their *followers* and of their *faction*, there is in their *pamphlets* too much such *Traiterous seed sown*. Upon which Dr. *Heylin* doth thus infer, *the Puritanes are, I see, beholding to you for lending them so faire a Cloak to hide their Knavery*: Directing this speech unto the *Lincolnshire Minister*, who had too much favoured the Puritanical Faction. I wish the people were as knowing, as the right Reverend Bishop *Bramhall* in this particular; who call's it no lesse then a *damnable slander*, and also *the venom, which the Puritan Faction infused into the hearts of the people, that the King and Bishops had an intention to reestablish the Roman Catholick Religion*. I wish the common people would *yet* consider (though it is *late*) that * *whited Sepulchres appear beautifull outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness. Even so yee also* (saith our Saviour Blessed for ever) *appear outwardly righteous unto men, but within ye are full of Hypocrisy and Iniquity*. And the *outward appearance of Righteousness* notwithstanding, our Saviour's *Erotesis* is very no more *terrible*, then it is *just*. * *How can yee escape the Damnation of Hell?* Sir, I wish you would consider the damning nature

The Lord Chancellor Egerton's *judgement of Puritans, in the Case of the* Post-Nati p. 99. Apud Antidot. Lincoliense p. 35. 36.

Bishop *Bramhals judgement of Puritanes*. In his *Answer to Militiere*. p. 46.

* Luk. 23. 27, 28.

* Verse 33.

ture of *Hypocrisy*, and how far D. *Owen* hath charg'd you with it, nay how far you were moved to charge *your self*. And boast no more (as now you do p. 29.) How many there are in *your own charge, who make a* shew *of the fear of God*. The Scribes and Pharisees *made a shew*, beyond the best of our English *outsides*. Those *Citizen-Puritanes made a shew* of the fear of God, whom yet our Excellent Bishop *Hall* did entertaine with these words.

Bishop *Hall*, of *Pharisaism and Christianity*. p. 380.

"How many are there of *you*, that under fair faces have "foul Consciences? —— All is good save that which ap-"peare's not. How many are there every where, that "shame Religion by professing it? Whose beastly life "makes God's truth suspected: for as, howsoever the "*Samaritan*, not the *Jew*, relieved the distressed *traveler*, "yet the *Jew's* Religion was true, not the *Samaritan's*; "so in others, truth of causes must not be judged by acts "of persons; yet, as he said, *it must needs be good that* Ne-"ro *persecutes*; so who is not ready to say: *It cannot be* "*good that such a miscreant professes*? Woe to thee *Hypo-*"*crite*: Thou canst not touch, not name goodness, but "thou defilest it; God will plague thee for *acting so high* "*a part*: See what thou art, and hate thy self; or (if not "that) yet see how God hate's thee; he that made the "heart, sayes thou art no better then an *handsome tombe*; "the house of death. Behold here a green turfe, or "smooth marble, or ingraven brasse, and a commending "Epitaph; all *sightly*: but *what is within*? an *unsavoury*, "*rotten carcasse*. Though thou were wrapt in gold, and "perfumed with never *so loud Prayers, hol; semblances, ho-*"*nest protestations*; yet thou art but *noysome carrion* to "God: Of *all earthly* things, *God cannot abide thee*; and "if thou wouldst see how much *lower* yet his detestation "reacheth, know that when he would describe the *tor-*"*ments of Hell*, he calls them (as their *worst* title) but the "*portion of Hypocrites*. Wherefore *cleanse your hands yee* "*sinners*, and *purge your hearts yee double-minded*: For un-"lesse your righteousness exceed the *Hypocriticall righ-*"*teousness* of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, yee shall *not enter* "*into the Kingdom of Heaven*.

Jam. 4. 8.

Sect. 42.

Sect. 42. You express your displeasure to me for saying, that I *was and would continue (by the grace of God assisting me) free from the great Abomination of the Presbyterian Directory.* And aske *what Papist would talk as* Mr. *P. doth, and not be able to name one thing in it that is abominable. p.* 33.] Perhaps the *Papists* have *kindness* for it, as tending to the disgrace of the *Protestant name*; and acting here in *Disguizes*, might likely have instigated your *brethren* to that *work* of *Schism* and *Disobedience*. But to all sound Protestants 'tis an *Abominable thing*, as you must needes have known by your *experience*, if you know but the English of the word βδέλυγμα, or of the easier word *Abomination*. Twas an *Abominable Directory*, for all those reasons to be collected. First from Mr. *Hooker's Ecclesiasticall Polity*, the writings of Archbishop *Whitgift*, Bishop *Bilson*, Dr. *Cosens*, Bishop *Buckridge*, Bishop *Morton*, Dr. *Burges*, before the Directory was made, of which you are minded by Dr. *Heylin*, * by whom you lately had the Honour to be exceedingly well instructed. Secondly and chiefly, from Dr. *Hammond's view of the Directory*, unanswered and unanswerable. Thirdly from the *Preface* of Dr. *Sanderson* so often cited. Attempt an answer if you are able. Fourthly from Dr. *Heylin* his *History of Liturgies*. Fiftly from a large *Preface* before a *Liturgy*, very commonly thought to be Dr. *Taylor's*. (How truely or falsely I cannot tell) wherein amongst thirty one *Enormities* justly imputed unto the *Directory*, it is observed to be *composed to the dishonour of the Reformation, accusing it of darkness and intolerable inconvenience. A Direction without a Rule. A Rule without restraint. A prescription leaving an indifferency to a possibility of licentiousness. Into which Heresie and Blasphemy may creep without prevention. Which still permit's children in many cases to be unbaptiz'd. And suffer's them not to be confirm'd at all. Joyne's in Marriage, as* Cacus *did his Oxen. Will not do piety to the dead. Never thinks of absolving Penitents. Recites no Creed, but entertain's Arians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Manichees, or any other Sect for ought appeares to the contrary. Consigns no*

The Presbyterian Directory exceedingly Abominable.

* P.64,65.

publick Canon of Communion, but leaves that as casual and fantastick as any other lesser offices. Never thanks God for the Redemption of the world by the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension of our Lord, but condemns the memoriall even of Scripture-Saints, and that of the miraculous blessings of Redemption of mankind by Christ himself; with the same accusation it condemns the legends and portentous stories of the Roman Calendar. Leaves no signature of piety upon the Lords day, and yet its Compilers do injoyne it to a Judaical Superstition. Implicitly undervalues the Lords Prayer, as never injoyning, and but once permitting it. Without Auctority, and never establish'd by act of Parlament. But it is farther yet *abominable*, for being *made*, and put in *use* by a spirit of opposition to the *best* Liturgy in the world by *Law* establish'd; for being highly *Schismatical*, and so far *pernicious* to the Soules of men, as it *beguiled* them of the nourishment which their *Mother* the Church had provided for them, and which by Law unrepealed became their *due*. Again, *Abominable* it was, by being a *work* of *Disobedience* to the *Supreme Governour of the Land*, who by a purposed *Proclamation* did most strictly *command* the *publick* use of the *Common Prayer*, and as strictly *forbid* the *use* or *Admission* of the *Directory*. (Of which anon I may tell you more.) Farther your *Directory* was *abominable* for the *Reasons* given in against it by the *University of Oxford. Sect.* 9. *p.* 32. 33, 34. And for those of Mr. *Thorndike* in his *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England*; and for what *your self* (Mr. *Baxter*) have writ *against it*. Which I do not here recite, because I have done it * *elsewhere*.

* *Look back on ch.* 6. *p.* 147.

2. Having mention'd a *Proclamation* set out against the *Directory* by the *then-confessed Supreme Magistrate*, I will in order to your conversion, and for the benefit of them who may chance to read me, (and may also need such information) set out the *Reasons* which are *there* rendred for the *prohibition* of the *Directory*, and for the constant *use* of the *Common Prayer*. The Reasons against the *former* are no more then *five*.

See Biblioth. Reg. Sect. 4. *p.* 335, 336.

1. It

I. It is a meanes to open the way, and give the liberty "to all ignorant, factious, or evil men, to broach their "own *Fancies* and *Conceits*, be they never so *wicked* and "*erroneous*, and to mislead people into *Sin* and *Rebellion*, "and to utter those things even in that which they make "for their Prayer in their Congregations, as in Gods pre-"sence, which no conscientious man can assent to say "*Amen* to.

The Kings Reasons against the Directory.

II. And let the Ministers be never so pious and religi-"ous, yet it will *break* that *uniformity* which hitherto "hath been held in God's Service and be a meanes to raise "*Factions* and *Divisions* in the Church.

III. And those many Congregations in this Kingdom, "where able and religious Ministers cannot be maintain-"ed, must be left destitute of all help and meanes for "their publick Worship and Service of God.

IV. No reason is given for this alteration, but onely in-"conveniency alledged in generall (and whether pride and "avarice be not the ground; whether Rebellion and De-"struction of Monarchy be not the intentions of some, and "Sacriledge and the Churches possessions the aimes and "hopes of others, and these *new-Directories* the meanes to "prepare and draw the people in for all, we leave to him "who searches and knowes the hearts of men.)

V. And this alteration is introduced by colour of Or-"dinances of Parliament made *without* and *against* our "consent, and *against* an *express act* of *Parliament* still in "force; and the same Ordinance is made, as perpetuall "binding Lawes, inflicting penalties and punishments; "which was never before these times, so much as preten-"ded to have been the use or power of *Ordinances* of "Parliament, to which we are to be *parties*.

On the contrary the Reasons for *the book of Common Prayer* are eight or nine in that *proclamation*.

The Kings Reasons for the Liturgy.

1. It was compiled in the times of Reformation by the "most pious and learned men of that age. 2. Defended "and confirmed with the Martyrdome of many. 3. Was "first established by Act of Parliament in the time of King

" *Edward* the *sixt*. 4. And never repealed or laid aside, " save onely in that short time of Queen *Marie's Reign*, " upon the return of *Popery* and *Superstition*. 5. In the first " year of Queen *Elizabeth* it was again *revived* and *esta-* " *blished* by *Act* of *Parliament*. 6. The *repeal* of it then " was declared by the whole Parliament, to have been to " the great *decay* of the due *honour* of *God* and *discomfort* " of the professors of the *truth* of *Christ's Religion*. 7. *E-* " *ver since* it hath been *used and observed* for above *four-* " *score years* together, in the best times of peace and plen- " ty that ever this Kingdom enjoyed. 8. It contains in it " an excellent form of *Worship and Service of God*, groun- " ded upon the *holy Scriptures*, and is a singular mean and " *help* to *Devotion* in all Congregations. 9. *That*, or *some* " *other* of the *like Form*, is *simply necessary* in those many " Congregations, which *cannot* be otherwise *supplied* by " learned and able men, and keeps up an *uniformity* in the " Church of *England*.

Adde to this the *confession* of the *Parliament-Commissi-* *ners* at the *Isle* of *Wight*, that *if his Majesty would* * *not agree, which depended meerly upon his will, no other Government could be set up*, and by consequence no other Liturgy, or any thing else in *lieu* of it. Adde to that also their prote- station, *not to offer the least violence to his Majesties Conscience*. Who also protested *it was his Conscience which enforced his Denial* of their *petition* in that poinr. I say *petition*, because their stile was no other, than * *we humbly beseech your Majesty*. Adde to all, his observation, that *his Conscience concurred fully with all other Parliaments (except that* One) *since the Reformation : and that if he should give way to remove all Ecclesiastical Sanctions which by Law are exercised, by that rule even the Presbyters themselves might be taken away. For questionless* (saith he, and I pray Mr. *Baxter* observe his reason) *the Civil Sanction gives the legal acting power to all Divine Institutions ; otherwise the Christian Clergy would now be in little better case than they were before they were Christians.*

* See Bibliath. Reg. Sect. 4. p. 353.

p. 354, 355, 358.

* p. 354.

p. 355.

p. 356.

3. How *Abominable* your *Directory* hath appeared to all

all *Protestants beyond the seas*, you may partly judge by a little Book intituled *A Character of England*, sent (it seems) by a *French Protestant* (residing here in *England*) to a *Nobleman* of *France*. Your Party is all along concerned from *p.* 12. to *p.* 23. But I took the more notice of what he saith p. 16. *That the Religion of* England *is preaching and sitting still on Sundayes*, because our learned Mr. *Thorndike* hath often touched on that string: shewing what care there hath been taken that there should be * *two Sermons a Sunday, with a prayer at the discretion of him that preaches; provided nothing be done to signifie that humility of mind, that reverence of heart, that devotion of Spirit, which the awful Majesty of God is to be served with.* And he adds in that place, (what I beseech you to lay to heart) *that even the frequency of preaching, which was the out side of the business (even granting it to be by the true rule of Faith) hath been so visibly so pitifully defective in the performance, that he must have a hard heart for our cõmon Christianity, who can think that there is wherewith to defend it from the scorn of Unbelievers, had they nothing to do but to mind it.*

* *Mr.* Thorndike's *Ep. to the Trag. of the Ch. of* Engl. *Conclus. p.* 420. *which compare with p.* 405.

4. Let me conclude this subject with that signal prophesie of the holy *Martyr Hippolitus*, That *in the dayes of Antichrist Liturgy shall be extinguish'd, Psalmody shall cease, Reading of the Scriptures shall not be heard.* In which three (saith our Reverend and Religious * Dr. *Hammond*) as the publick service of God was by the Ancients thought to consist; so the destroying of all and each of them must needs be a *branch*, if not the whole body of *Antichristianism*; a direct *Contradiction to Christ*, who, by his own *prescription* or *practise* of each of these, impress'd a sacred character on *each*, *Luke* 11. 2. *Mat.* 26. 30. *Luke* 4. 17.

Λειτουργία σβεσθήσεται, ψαλμῳδία παυσθήσεται, ἀνάγνωσις τῶν γεγραμμένων οὐκ ἔσται ἀκουσθήσεται. *Bib. Patr. Grac. Tom.* 2. *p.* 357.

* *Preface p.* 5. *before his paraphrase and Annot. on the Psalmes.*

Sect. 43. I now proceed unto the *last*, which is withall the most *desperate* instance of your *Impiety*, *Rashness* and *wilful Railing*; for which you are utterly *unexcusable*, whether you spake in the *dark*, or quite *against* your *own* *Light*

Concerning Coppinger & Hacket *and the communication of their Design to the presbyterian Ministers.*

Light, concerning the *Presbyterians Ministers* in Queen *Elizabeths* time, whom I had affirmed from Bishop *Bancroft*, (as *he* from *letters* which pass'd between them, as well as from *Messages* and *Confessions* publickly taken in the *Star-chamber*) to have been privately made acquainted with the bloody design of Mr. *Hacket*, *Coppinger*, *Arthington*, and the rest; of which you say they knew no more than either *Augustin* or *Luther*; and that I might as *honestly have said the One* as the *Other*. Nor doth your *Daringness* rest there, but you (or rather your *furiousness*, for you could not certainly be *your self*, when you flung about you in such a manner) affirm, *I could not have uttered more falshood then I had done, if satan had dictated to me.* Thus you precipitate your passion, not so much against *me* as against *Archbishop Bancroft*, from whose Authority I spake, and whom you fear not to call *The most violent persecutor of the Puritans*, p. 34, 35.]

Now (Sir) *cool* your self a little, and honestly answer to my *Dilemma*. Did you *know* the business whereof you spake, or did you not? If you *knew* it, why did you write *against* your *knowledge* in so plain a matter of *Fact*? or why did you not attempt to prove your *Negative*, to wit, That *Cartwright* and *Traverse* and the rest were *not privy to the plot*? Why did you not *consult* with *Bancroft's dangerous positions*, to which I referred in my *Margin*, naming his *chapters* and his *pages*, and specifying the *year* in which 'twas printed, that you might not be *capable* of an *Error* by any mistake of the *Edition*? Nay why would you say in plain terms, *That you know not, nor much regard what I have read in* Bancroft? as if you should have said, [*you were resolv'd to give Mr.* Pierce *the Lie*, and to *compare* him with *satan right or wrong*, *without examining* his Citations, *without knowing* what he hath read, and *without regarding* what is written by Learned *Bancroft*, or upon what kind of *Evidence* that Book proceeds.] Do not you think there is a God? or do you imagine he cannot *see* you? or do you hope he will *not judge* you *according to your works*? what should make you thus *fearless*, I can never sufficiently

sufficiently admire, if you *knew* the business whereof you spake. And if you shall say you *knew it not*, how durst you say at all adventure, that *if Satan had dictated to me I could not have uttered more falshood*? I for my part had a perfect knowledge of what I writ. And since the reading of your *boldness* (which I could not have thought possible, but that I have read it) I have called the *eyes* of *others* to bare witness with mine *own*. And in my *necessary Defense*, I am enforced to discover you to all that read me, first, by desiring them to compare my *Self-Revenger Exemplified*, *ch.3. p.73.* with the *pages* of *my Author* referred to in the *Margin*. Next, by directing all my Readers to a *later Edition of Bancrofts Dangerous positions*, much more easily to be had, as having been printed no longer since than the Year 1640. by *R. Young* and *R. Badger*. Thirdly, by pointing them to the *pages* wherein the *Narratives* are to be seen, and that from the *Letters* partly, partly from the *Mouthes* of the Malefactors themselves, partly from their *hand-writings*, partly from *witnesses* upon *Oath* in an eminent Court of Jurisdiction, with a perfect knowledge of all which, that equally prudent and pious Author had been abundantly furnished and instructed, towards the making of that elaborate and usefull Book. Viz. *Chapter VI. p.* 144. Their Fast was kept at Mr. *Lancaster's* house a School-master. Then *p.* 145. *Coppinger* wrote of his *Instigations to some Preachers in the Realm*, by name to one *Gibson in Scotland*. Then *p.*146. He sent a letter to Mr. *Cartwright*. The effect of which follow's *p.* 147. Especially *p.* 149. Twas dated *Feb.* 4. 1590. And began, *Right Reverend Sir, your most wise and Christian Counsell, together with offer to take knowledge by writing from me, &c.* It mention'd the number of his *Fasts*, his severall *Callings*, and his writing to some *Preachers within the Realm*, as well as *without*. Then *p.* 150. Mr. *Cartwright* sent a *message* to *Coppinger*, *that he should attempt nothing but by Advice, that he should be wise and circumspect*. And a time for conference was appointed. Then *p.* 151. It appeare's, that *Coppinger* sent Letters also to Mr. *Clark*,

Mr.

Mr. *Traverse*, and Mr. *Egerton*. Then concerning the appearance in the *Star-Chamber*, his Letter to Mr. *Udall*, Mr. *Carthright's* resolving some Questions for him, the *eight Preachers fasting and praying for Coppinger's successe*, see Chapter 8. p. 156. 157. *Especially* p. 158. For his Letter to Mr. *Chark*, July 9. 1591. and to a *Preacher* not named, and *Penry's* Advertisement out of *Scotland*, see Chap. 10. *p.* 163. 164, 165. That this Conspiracy was for Discipline, see Chapter 12. *p.* 168, &c. And how far the Ministers were accessary, see Chapter 13. and Chapter 14. from *p.* 171. to *p.* 176. Lastly see how *Hacket's Treasons*, had they but prosper'd, had been defended by the Disciplinary Doctrin, *ch.* 15. *p.* 176. to *p.* 182.

Now, Mr. *Baxter*, consider sadly, and repent in such a measure (of your uncharitable speeches) as to beware what you *speak*, much more what you *write*, much more what you *publish* to your indeleble dishonour. Consider what you have printed of Sir *Henry Vane*, and the *Vanists*, and compare your *Author* (if you have any) with the Wisdome, Learning, Piety, Renown, and *Archiepiscopal See* of our incomparable *Bancroft*; who was deservedly advanced by Queen *Elizabeth*, and *King James*, for having contributed so largely to the timely preservation of Church and State, as well from the *Papists* on the *one* side, as from the *Puritanes* on the other. Could you not think it was crime enough, to deny the *Sun's shining*, when we behold him in his *Meridian*, (I mean a *truth* as *bright* as that) but you must bitterly *raile* against him that *say's* it, with a *Cochlaeus*, and a *Bolseck*, and a *slanderous tongue*, imposed on him? This (you know) is the language, with which you treat me for speaking *truth*, *p.* 35. *l.* 1. 2, 3. and which doth most of all reflect upon the memory and fame of Bishop *Bancroft*. O do not suffer your eyes to sleep, nor the Temples of your head to take any rest, till in the bitternes of your afflicted repentant soul, you have sought to God for a *Remission* of this impiety.

I shall not now handle your other Calumny, whereby you make me an arrant *Papist*, (p. 36.) Because I have told

told you enough of *that*, in the *beginning* of this *Appendix*. What I said of the *Presbyterians*, their bloody *Principles*, and Practice, you do so far *confirm*, as you appeare to have *nothing* to say *against it*. And hence I rationally conclude, that you are not so *stupid*, as not to *see* your Enormities; but so desperately *stomachfull*, as not to *mend* them.

Of Dr. Steward's Sermon at Paris, and Dr. Heylin's Antipuritanisme.

Sect. 44. After your *Preface*, there come's a *Postscript*. Wherein you do not at all *discharge*, but poorly *sneake* from a *duty* incumbent on you. The end which was clearly aimed at in recommending the *Sermon* of Dr. *Steward* to your consideration, you might have seen (had you been pleas'd) in the *last part* of the *Preface*. For that Sermon having been preached by so eminent a *Prelatist* and *Antipuritane*, in *defence* of the *Protestants* against the *Papists*, and that to an Auditory of *Prelatists* in the *chief City* of *France*, become's an Argument not to be answer'd, that such *Episcopal* persons as Dr. *Steward* (who yet was one of the highest straine and as near the *Archbishop* as it is possible to imagin,) had not any design to introduce the *French Popery*, as *you* in severall publick writings had most uncharitably suggested. Now of this one thing, which was most pertinent, you were resolv'd to take no notice. Whereas you say that Dr. *Heylin disclaimeth Grotianisme*, you either lamentably *equivocate*, or speak against your own *Conscience*. For as I take the word, the Reverend *Doctor* doth espouse it as much as I. And as *you* scandalously mistake it, I *disclaim* it as much as that Reverend *Doctor*. The name of *Grotius* import's a *Protestant*, a *Peacemaker*, an *Antipuritan* and a *Prelatist*. In which sense (if you please) we *all* are *Grotians*; and Dr. *Steward* as much as *any*. In that you call Dr. *Heylin* an *Antipuritan*, you do him very much *Right*; for *that* hath gain'd him the favour of God and good men. But in that you say he is a *hot* one, you do your self as much *wrong*, because you give him an *uncivil* and *sawcy* Epither. And well it were if this had been the *worst* of your dealings with him. Remember the quality of his *person*, the universality of his *Learning*, the dig-

nity of his *place* in the Church of God, and the honour due unto his *sufferings* for Conscience sake, and you will find it agreeable to a man of *your pitch*, rather mannerly to bow down your knee *before* him, than contumeliously to lift up your fist *against* him. You confesse that he sent you a *moderate Letter*, and that * *my dealing with you was moderate, brotherly, charitable*, and *gentle*. What then should move you to use us *worse*, than the *severest* of them that have writ against you, unlesse you thought that our *Civility* was onely an Argument of our *Fear*? you told Mr. † *Tombes you have a spirit of keennesse in you*. But it seemes that *spirit* was *exorcized* for a season, when you dealt with that person whose very * *Scholar* had told you, *you could not speak congruously*; and whom you affirm to have call'd you † *unlearned Scribler, tyring the Presse with your impertinencies, if not with impious and monstrous Heresies*. You answer'd as *calmely* to these expressions, as if you had purposely reserved your whole *stock of virulence* for whosoever should happen to use you *gently*. Dr. *Heylin* and I (whilst you were capable) did use you as gently as you could *wish*. You have *acknowledged* our Candor, and put it also upon *Record*. Yet in how *prodigal* a manner have you *bestow'd* your *whole stock* upon *him*, and *me*? allowing *me onely* a *treble portion*, for having most of all *exceeded* in my expressions of *Love* and *Moderation*. Compare my *first behaviour* towards you, (which had something in it to *oblige*, but nothing at all to *provoke* you,) with your *acknowledgments* of the same in the *first addresse* which you made unto me; and call your self to an *accompt*, what it was which could ingage you in such an *uncharitable Requital*. You made Confession to * Mr. *Tombes* of your *guilt* in this kind; But pleaded too in your own excuse, † that *you had not the twentieth part of* Mr. *Calvin's keennes to Baldwin and Cassander*; * and *that you are less Censorious now then ever*. Is this to the credit of Mr. *Calvin*, that he was *twenty times worse* then Mr. *Baxter*, in point of *railing*? Never did *Bolsec* revile him *more*. And if in your *last three Volumes* you have shew'd us the *fruits* of your *amendment*, we do

* Grot. Rel. Pref. Sect. 4.

† p. 281.

* See your Tract of saving Faith, p. 14.

† Ibid. p. 87.

* p. 281.

† Ibid. p. 274.

* Ibid. p. 281.

do earnestly desire you to *mend no more*. But if you meditate an answer either to *me*, or to any *else* of the Church of England, do not addict your self to *Calumny*, and think it sufficient to call it *keenness*. It was not *keenness*, but *Falshood*, which made me think it my duty to change my stile. If it shall prove to do you *good*, I shall change it again in your *Commendation*. Deal but *Faithfully* with *me*, and shew your *Favour* to whom you please. For if you bring but *Truth* with you, your *greatest Freedom* will find *most welcome*.

For the Reverend and my much respected Friend Doctor Peter Heylin *at* Lacies *Court in* Abbingdon.

REVEREND SIR,

HAving so far comply'd with my inclinations, as to begin with the *second part* of your *Certamen Epistolare*, wherein you have excellently cleared our *Common Mother* from the *Historical part* of a *dishonest Rhapsodie*, which Mr. *Hickman the man of scorn* (as you have fitly * describ'd his *Nature* by the signification of his *Name*) had most dishonorably *purloined* from those two *Ordinary Collections*, [Mr. *Prinn's Antiarminianism*, and his *Canterburie's Doom*,] in which your pertinent *observation* you have *many men's eyes* to bear you *witness*, (who had long since observed as much in *private*, as you have *now* made † known in *print*,) and having read it quite over with as many degrees of *satisfaction*, as our deplorable *Fletcher* hath done with *grief*, I hold it my duty to send my *thanks* in as publick a manner of conveyance, as that by which I received my *obligation*.

* P. 192.

† P. 149, 150.

My *obligation* would have been *weighty*, although it had *lain* upon me no otherwise, than upon every *true Son* of the *Church* of *England*; and even *so* you might have challenged my hearty thanks. But that you were pleas'd to * consider the *multiplicity of my Employments*, and (in that consideration) *to bear a part of my Burden*, that you were

* P. 116.

were pleas'd to chastise so *inconsiderable a Scribler*, and to do it chiefly at *my incitement*, (notwithstanding my being a *stranger* to you) this I take to be a favour, for which it is not sufficient to pay you *thanks*, unless I also desire your *pardon*.

I say, your *pardon* so much the rather, because I knew the *Disparity between your persons*; I well consider'd it was *below* you, to oppose your *strength* to so much *weakness*; I knew the man was *unworthy* of so much Favour, as to *fall* under the weight of so *Grave a hand*. Nay (not to conceal any thing from you which stand's in *need* of an *excuse*) I did esteem him the meanest Disputant, that I had ever yet dealt with in these affaires. I found Mr. *Barlee* some Formes *above* him, and wonder'd why he made use of so poor a helper. Nay though I alwaies intended (and *still* intend) to call his *Rhapsody* to account, not so much for the *weakness*, as the extreme great *wickedness* of the thing, yet did I intend it as nothing else, but a resolute act of my *Condescension*, to which (for the *safety* of his Disciples) I shall cheerfully stoop, as my *Leisure* serve's me.

But being engaged with Mr. *Baxter*, before Mr. *Hickman* had put his *name* to the English writings of *other men*, (as I shall manifest hereafter in greater measure then you imagin;) and timely foreseeing it would be *late*, before my manifold Employments of greater moment would give me leave to descend to so mean a taske; and having been importun'd by diverse persons, *to let out the wind of that Bladder which popular breath had puff'd up to so great a Bigness*; and verily thinking it *unsafe*, (as well for *him*, as his poor *Admirers*,) to let him prosper in his impiety and *pride* himself in his *unhappiness*, untill I could have leisure to make him *humbler*; and conceiving that Mr. *Prinn* was a *Learned person*, (as well as a *person* of *years*, and *Quality*,) who could not cease to be the *Author* of *all* those Arguments of which Mr. *Hickman* is the *Transcriber*, by their being reprinted in any *Plagiarie's Name*; and knowing well that those Arguments might very usefully be answer'd, though not as *filtch'd by* Mr. *Hickman*,

yet

yet as *belonging* to Mr. *Prin*; and calling to mind the great *Readiness*, as well as *exactness* of your Conceptions joyn'd to the zeal which you had shew'd for the *Church* of *England*, and your personal concernment in diverse *Calumnies*, and *slanders*, which the *Brasier* (as you call him) had cast upon you; I took upon me so great a Confidence (how *unhappily* soever a *stranger* to you) as to sollicite you to ingage against the *Historicall way of arguing*, which yet (you know) I did acknowledge *too much below you*.

As for the part which is remaining, concerning the *positive entity of Sin*, in which *alone* I am peculiarly concern'd, and which you tell me *you* * *leave to my sole management*, (making me also a greater Complement, then either my *Modesty* or my *Merit* is any way able to support,) I make no doubt but I shall publish such an accompt of that affaire, as will not faile of your approbation. 'Twere easie to do it in a *few pages*, so as to give satisfaction to men of *Learning*; but then it would not be so easie to *vulgar* Readers, whom I do chiefly consider in what I publish, that they may not be in danger to think that *Sins* are *God's Creatures*, by thinking God is the Creator of *all things reall*. And it being my purpose, not onely to *humble* and put to *silence*, but to *Convince* and *convert* so bold a Libertine, I shall contentedly be as *large* in my intended enterprise, as needes I must be, to be *perspicuous*. For *Truth* to some Readers is nothing *worth*, if it is not brought to them with *light* and *plainness*. And if I shall prove it as *bright* a *Truth*, that *Sin is positively something*, as that the parts of the *Circumference* are *aque distant* from the *Centre*; or that *equal* parts being *taken* from *equall* parts, the parts remaining must needes be *equall*; I hope the *scorner himself* will be my *Convert*. And indeed when I consider his several grosse *Contradictions*; his being forced to *confess* (in a lucid interval) what he doth stomachfully *deny*, whensoever he think's it a *shame* to *yield*; his most *deliberate mistaking* the thing in Question, that he may have what to *say*, though not to *Answer*; his *wilfull Omissions* to speak at all to the *greatest part* of my many Arguments,

* P. 149.

Arguments, and his not attempting the *force* of *One* by any thing like unto a pertinent and fair resistance; when I consider with what *Resistance* he proceed's at *last* to *that subject*, in which (and in which alone) he was particularly concern'd; with how many and long *Prefaces* transcrib'd *verbatim* from Mr. *Prynn*, and other *late English Writers* (whom I shall name in due season) he hath labour'd to *hide* his *main cause* from his Reader's *eyes*, *posting* it over in a *few pages*, towards the *end* of his *Hotch-Potch*, or *Gallimaufrie*; I think I have reason to suspect, that the man is exactly of *my opinion*, (as to the *positive entity of Sin*) but onely remember's I am a man whom they call a *Prelatist*, and he is a *rigid Presbyterian*, (that is) a *Puritane in grain*, and so he will *seem* to *resist* me, as far as *slandering* and *Railing* come's to, for fear his *Abettors* should apprehend that I have wrought a *change* in him.

I must therefore endeavour to overcome his *perversness* as well as to dissipate the *error* which he pretends to. That if he shall finally *persevere* in his present course, and write *against* his own *light*, the common people may clearly see, he is rather *obstinate* than *erroneous*, or else *affectedly* erroneous; by being *obstinate*. And in order to the attaining so good an end, I intend to satisfie *their* Objections, which Mr. *Hickman* by *adoption* hath made his *own*; and which for want of apprehension, or something else, he hath not managed as he ought to his best advantage. I am not ignorant of the *Quiver*, out of which he hath taken his heaviest *Shafts*, and which I shall choose so much the rather to break in *shivers* before his eyes, that he may hurt himself no more with such *leaden weapons*, as he shall find by experience he cannot *weild*.

The man *confesseth* in his Conclusion, that in the *body* of his *Book* there are certain * *sore places*; by this good token that he so bids me to *stick upon them*: but what he means by *sore places*, or where they *lye*, he has the policy not to tell me. Again he confesseth (in the *same page*) that there are several † *sick and weak parts of his Discourse*; by this good token I am forbid *to fall on them*: but he conceals

* See the Book Edit. 2. p. 108. l. 3. & 4. from the bottom.

† Ibid.

ceals *what parts* are understood by himself to be *sick and weak*, for fear I should carefully *avoid* them, and onely fall upon that which he thinks is *soundest*, and thereby leave him without *excuse*. For this expressly he tells his Reader, that *if I shall stick onely upon a sore place, and fall on the sick and weak parts of his Discourse —he will vindicate himself onely with contempt and silence.* And so by this he hath *compell'd* me to undertake his *main Body*, and to *charge* it quite *through*, (whether *sick* or *sound*) because he hath not afforded a *mark* of *Difference*. For if I am left to mine own judgment, I shall pronounce his *main Body* (as he ridiculously calls it) to be nothing else but *a great sore*. *All the parts* of his Book (if yet you will allow me to call it *His*) do seem to *me* to be extremely both *sick and weak*: so as according to that condition, upon which he threatens *contempt and silence*, I am not to meddle with him at all, as being sure that I shall fall upon a *sick and sore part*.

A Fore-taste of Mr. Hickman's *condemnation of himself for the worst of Blasphemies.*

For if I begin with the *Hateing of God*, which he first *confesseth* to be an *Action*, and secondly *confesseth* to be a *Sin*, and thirdly *confesseth* to be a Sin of that nature, that it can *never* be any thing else, *by any circumstance of Time or Place*, and fourthly *confesseth* to be a *positive Entity*, and fiftly *confesseth* to be a *whole Sin*, and sixtly *confesseth* to be *complexum Quid*, (as I had often affirmed and he denied) and seventhly *confesseth* by unavoidable implication, that *half a sin* is *not* a *whole* one, and that it was a *whole sin* which was the *subject* of our *Debate*, and that *one part alone* cannot make up the *whole* which is confessed to consist of *two parts together*: and if I shall aske him hereupon, whether the Divel's *Hateing of God*, which he once confesseth to be a *sin* and a *positive entity*, is taken by *him* and his *Abettors* to be one of *Gods creatures* or *God himself*, (as *every positive entity* hath been *affirmed* by him to be;) I say, in case I shall begin to shew him the *Blasphemy* of his Doctrin, and to shew it out of his own *Confessions*, the man will be apt to requite me with *contempt* and *silence*, for *sticking* so fast (at the beginning) on such a very *sore*

place. For he confesseth to the *Lecturers* to whom he *dedicateth* his book, that *the making God the Author of sin* is not onely the sin of *Blasphemy*, but the *worst sin* of the kind too; yet he teacheth in his book, that God is the Author of the Divels *hateing of God*, which is the worst of all sins. And such himself doth *confess* it in down-right terms, that I may do him no wrong, (which he will be ready to object, how much soever * against his Knowledge) I will set down the *pages* and the *lines*, in which I find him affirming these following things.

* Note his fraudulent intimation that I had not instanced in *the hateing of God*, (p. 91.) when yet I had done it, *Auloxal. ch. 2. p. 83.* and elsewhere.

Mr. Hickman's *confessions of what is Truth.*

1. *That the hateing of God is the very worst, and most intrinsecally evill of all actions, p. 93. l. ult. and penult.*

2. *That such actions are called intrinsecally evil, both because they are evil antecedently to any positive Law, and because they are evil* ex genere & objecto, *and not meerly through the want of some circumstance, p. 94. l. 6, 7, &c.*

3. *That the hateing of God is such an action, as no circumstance of time or place can make lawful, p. 94. l. 16, 17.*

His unavoidable guilt of Blasphemy.

4. *That it belongs to the universality of the first Cause to produce not onely* every Real Being, *but also the real positive* Modifications *of* Beings, *p. 95. l. ult. and penult.*

His Inconsistencies with himself.

Now I would know of Mr. *Hickman*, (and require him to give me a *Categorical Answer*) whether for *Satan to hate God* is a *sin* or *no sin*: if he shall answer it is *no sin*, he will not onely *declare* himself to be a down-right *Libertine*, but directly *contradict* his own *confession* in the *first* affirmative of the *four* which I have just now cited. If he shall answer, *it is a sin, and the very worst of all sins*, I would demand a second time, whether that *Hateing of God* (which he thus *confesseth* to be a *sin*) is a *Real Being*, or *not*? if he shall answer that *it is*, then he concludes it to be *produced by God himself, the First cause*, unless he will *eat* his *own words* in the *fourth affirmative* I just now cited. But if he shall answer that *it is not*, he will not onely contradict the concordant Judgments of all Mankind, but flatly deny his *own words* in the *third* affirmative of the *four*,

four, which I have just now cited. For *there* he saith it is an *action*, which he must grant to be a *Real Being*, which is somewhat *more* than a real positive *Modification of Being*, of which he also makes God to be the *Author*.

How he makes God the Author of sin in a way of expression more unexcusable.

I say the *Author* for this good reason, because he must needs be the *Author* of every thing which he *produceth*, and he must needs *produce* every thing, which it *belongeth* to him to *produce* : and Mr. *Hickman* is express in his *fourth assertion* above cited, that *it belongeth to the universality of the first Cause to produce every Real Being, &c.* Hereupon I would aske him, which is the *worst* of the two, the saying of God, that he *produceth the Devils hateing God*, or that he is the *Author* of it ? Both are fearfully *blasphemous*, but yet the former is *more horrid*, and the later morecapable of a *comparative excuse*, however in it self it is *unexcusable*. For to say, *he produceth*, implies him to be the *efficient Cause* ; whereas the word *Author* doth often signifie somewhat *less* ; as I have made appear from *Classick Writers* (Αὐτοχαλ. *ch.* 3. *p.* 188.)

His other way of expression the most horrible of all.

Again I would know of Mr. *H.* which of these *Blasphemies* is the *worst*; to say that God is the *Author*, or that he is the *Creator* of the Divel's *hateing of God*, which he confesseth to be an *act* at once *intrinsecally and essentially evil*. To say he is the *Creator*, is the more formidable expression, and that for the Reasons which I have rendered in my Αὐτοχαλαξεις. Yet of this formidable *Blasphemy* this wretched *Caitiff* must needs be guilty, unlesse he will timely renounce his most irrational *Dichotomie*, (which was the very first cause of our whole dissension) to wit, that *every thing positive* must either be *one of God's Creatures*, *or God himself* ; there being *no medium* (saith he) *inter Deum & Creaturam* ; meaning *Creaturam Dei*, as he hath often *explained* himself. For when I told him that those *Sins* which were *positive things* (to wit, such Sins of *Commission*, as *Adultery*, *Blasphemy*, and the *hateing of God*, were neither *God*, nor God's *Creatures*, but onely the *Creatures* of *men and Devils*, abusing the *Liberty* of their *wills* by such acts of *Rebellion* against their *Soveraign*, who could not possibly

* *Prov.* 1. 22, 25, 29, 30.

possibly *produce* them *against himself*; the *man of* * *scorn* betook himself to *mock* and *laugh* at my instruction. And yet he appeare's to be asham'd of his *Blasphemous Dichotomie*, in that he doth not twice mention it (for ought I am able to remember) throughout the whole *Progress* of his *defense*. And yet he knew that *that alone* was made the *Apple* of *Contention*, in the 18. *Section* of the *third Chapter* of my *Ἀυλοκαλάκειοις*, to which he knew he was *obliged* to shape his *Answer*.

Perhaps (Sir) your leisure may not have serv'd you, to have read any more of Mr. *Hickman*, then what you had read in Mr. *Prinn*, before Mr. *Hickman* could have affix'd his *Name* to it; I mean the *Narrative* and *Historical part*, which hath not any thing to do with the *positive entity of Sin*. At least you may not have had the *patience* to compare particulars with particulars, as being resolv'd to leave *that* to be performed by my self, to whom indeed it doth belong as a *peculiar Province*. And hence I think it the less impertinent, to entertain you with a few *more* of the man's *Assertions*; that by his mixtures of *Truth* and *Falsehood*, his *Confessions* of what he *denies*, and *denials* of what he *confesseth*, you may see how *inconsistent* he is with *himself*, and how (before he is aware) he is forc'd to *stoop* and *bow* to me. His *assertions* I mean are these that follow.

Another taste of his Contradictions and Blasphemies.

1. *That sin is an abstract word, and doth not in its signification connote, any subject*. p. 53. l. 4, 5. Nay that *sin is so perfectly an abstract, that if we conceive not of it as an abstract, we conceive not of it as sin*. p. 54. l. 9, 10.

And yet he as peremptorily asserteth,

2. *That the hateing of God is Complexum Quid, and must not be spoken of as if it were one*. p. 95. l. 14, 15. Nay *that there is a material part of sin & a formal part of sin, and odisse Deum* is *totum Complexum*. (p. 94. l. 20, 23, 24.) *And that in evil works there are two things considerable: The works themselves and their pravity, of which the works are from God*. p. 96. l. 6, 7, 8.

He further Add's,

3. *That sin and sinfulness are Synonymum to him and therefore*

therefore he may use them promiscuously, meaning by them, what the Latines do by Peccatum, pravitas, malitia. p.53. l.3. from the Botom. &c. p. 54.

And yet he peremptorily saith,

4. *That the hateing of God is an action, which no Circumstance of time or place can make lawfull. p. 94. l. 16, 17. And that it is an act intrinsecally and essentially evil, — because evil antecedently to any positive law, and because evil ex genere & objecto. p.94. l.6.7,8,9.*

And yet again he affirmeth,

5. *That in the hateing of God, the vital action of hatred is a thing positive, but the terminating of that act to such an object which is altogether lovely, that's the sinfulness of the action, and not positive, but privative. p.95. l.16,17. &c.*

After this he saith expresly,

6. *That all positive things are from God. p. 96. l.9, 10. And*

7. *That their pravities add no new entities to them. Ibid. l.11,12.*

Now (Sir) not to take notice of his not knowing any difference between a *Logicall*, a *Physicall*, and a *Metaphysicall abstract*; not to *course* him (as in the *Horse-faire*) for making *hatred* to be an *action*, which every *Sciolist* know's to be a *quality*, as if he knew not yet the difference betwixt *odium* and *odisse*, and had not so much as a *taste* or *tincture* of *Aristotle's well*; it were too easie to write a volume, in *numbring* up and *displaying* the many *Absurdities*, *Blasphemies*, and *self-contradictions*, which this *Reviler of the Archbishop (and of all that is venerable or sacred)* stand's guilty of in his Adventures. — 1. Sin is *perfectly an abstract*; and yet it is *Complexum Quid*. 2. We *cannot conceive* it as it is *sin*, unless we *conceive* it as an *abstract*; and yet it consists of *two parts*, or *two things are considerable in it*, (as Doctor *Twisse*, Mr. *Whitfield*, Mr. *Barlee*, and indeed his whole party, have still distinguish'd, as well as *he*.) 3. The *hateing of God* is *essentially evil*, and yet *it is* (forsooth) *from God*. For it is an *action*, and so a *positive thing*, *and all positive things* (he also saith) *are from God*.

4. The

4. The hateing *of God* must not be spoken of *as one*; and yet he confesseth, some do *but feign that such an act is separated from its pravity (p. 94. l. 26. 27.)* 5. In the *hateing of God*, he saith the *action is positive*, and so *God's Creature*, (according to his division of all positive things) and so *exceedingly good*; and yet he saith the *hateing of God is* an *act* or *action essentially evil, evil intrinsecally, evil antecedently* to any positive Law, *evil ex genere & objecto.* 6. The *determinating* of that *act* to a lovely object he call's the *sinfulness of that action*, and yet that action of *hateing God* is a *sin*, yet *sinfulness and sin are to him Synonymous.* 7. To *hate God* is a *sin*, and yet an *action*, the *pravity* of which he saith is the *sinfulness* of the action, yet *sin* is *perfectly an abstract*, and the same with *sinfulness.* 8. He saith that *sinfulness* is meerly *privative*, and yet he calls it the *determinating of the act to the object*, and to *determine* such an act is the *positive action* of the *will*, and so the *positive* must be *privative* because 'tis *positive.* 9. In the *hateing of God* he doth distinguish two things, the one good, the other evil; and yet confesseth 'tis *wholly evil*; and must confesse it (in despight of his obstinacy) because *hatred not fasten'd upon God*, is not *hatred of God*, and so it is not the *thing in Question.* 10. To *hate God* is an *evil work*, a *work of darkness* and of the *Devil.* Yet in all *evil works*, Mr. *H.* saith the *work it self* is *positive and from God.* 11. If he thinkes it a *sin* to *hate God*, he thinkes that *sin* an *evil work*, and a *positive action*, and so *grants* what he *denies.* But if he reteineth his opinion, that *all positive things are from God or Gods creatures*, then he *denies* what he *grants*, that *to hate God is a sin*; or else it is clearly his opinion, that *the sin of hateing of God* is one of *Gods creatures*, and by consequence that God is the *Author of it*, which he confessed in his Epistle to be the *worst of all Blasphemies.* 12. To conclude, if he will stand to what he hath printed, that the *hateing of God* is an *action*, and so a *positive thing*, and so *from God*, and so *no sin*, then be it known to all the world that Mr. *Hickman* is a *Libertine* in the most *desperate degree*, for as much as he believes it *no sin to hate God.*

And

And now we need no longer doubt, whether he thinks it a sin *to hate his Neighbours*, especially them whom he hath injur'd both by *railing*, and *slandering*, and *filching* too. Had he not sinn'd against *you* (Sir) in *all three kinds*, against the *Bishop* of *Lincoln*, Mr. *Morrice*, and Mr. *Prinne* in the *last*, and against Mr. *Goodwin* both in the *first* and the *last*: Had he not sinn'd in the *second* kind, by slandering the late *Archbishop* of *Canterbury*, and our Reverend Dr. *Hammond*, both as conspicuous as the *Day* for their exceeding great *Learning*, and for the *spotlesness* of their *Lives*. And had he not added to all this, his *contempt* and *scorn* of *Tilenus*, calling him *Scribler*, *Æthiopian*, a *poor Fellow*, and objecting to him a *piece of Impudence*; and had he not provoked me yet infinitely more, by *dishonouring* that *God*, for the passionate *Love* of whose *Glory* we ought to hate our own *Souls*; I had not treated the *Malefactor* with so much *strictness* as now I do. *Nebuchadnezzar* made a *Decree*, *That whosoever should speak any thing amiss against the God of* Shadrach, Meshach *and* Abednego, *they should be* (*forthwith*) *cut in pieces, and their houses be made a dunghil:* Had Mr. *Hickman* but *spoken* what he hath *printed* at the critical time of that Decree, he had infallibly *been cut in pieces*. The God of *Shadrach* is the God whom I *serve*; and though I know too well what spirit I am of, to *cut* mine Adversary *in pieces*, yet I will choose my self to be *cut in pieces*, (as by *slanders* and *forgeries* I have sufficiently been) rather than suffer the poor people to be perverted into *Libertines*, whilst I am able to *hope* that I may possibly *prevent* it. Had I but one drop of Inke in my disposal, I would imploy it in the Cause, in which by *Conscience* I am engaged. For if the people be brought to think, that *Adultery and Murder are the works of God*, (as even *Zuinglius* and Dr. *Twisse*, men exceedingly superiour to Mr. *Hickman*, have taken the boldness to affirm and defend) nay, if the Divel's *hateing God* is *confessed* to be a *positive thing*, by the same Mr. *Hickman* who also *teacheth*, that *all positive things are either God's creatures, or God himself*, and if as many as do *mistake* him for a *good scholler*, or a *good*

How his principles run out into practise.

Dan. 3. 29.

good man, shall by the help of the *tempter* embrace the Doctrine, alas how greedily will they run into *sin* and *hell*? supposing that *sin* is nothing more than a *term of policy*, invented by *Churchmen* and *Politicians* to keep their people in good obedience; and that *all real Beings* must needs be *good*, as being *produced* by the *first cause*, (saith Mr. *Hickman*) or else that *blasphemies*, *cursings*, and *hatreds of God*, if they are not *good* and *produced* by *God*, are no *real Beings*, and that will serve their turn as well. When the people cannot *separate*, nor so much as *distinguish* the *hateing God* from the *sin* of *hateing God*, and also find it to be the judgment of the learnedst Divines in all the world, that the *Act* and the *obliquity* (in the *hateing of God*) are so *inseparably* united, as that the *Author* of the *one* must needs be the *Author* of the *other*, how can they keep out of the *snare* which Mr. *Hickman* hath laid before them, unless we make them see clearly, that Mr. *Hickman* is a *blind* and deceitful *guide*? The more the man is esteemed by certain *short-sighted souls*, who discern not the difference betwixt *Purity* and *Puritanism*, or betwixt a *Preacher* and a *Divine*, by so much the more (like * *Jeroboam*) he hath the miserable priviledge of *making Israel to sin*; and so by a consequence unavoidable, the greatest *charity* to his *soul*, is to make him *lest scandalous*, by making him *vile* in the *people's eyes*; or rather by *proving* him as vile, as *he* and *he onely* hath *made himself*.

* 2 Kings 10: 31.

* *Tilenus Junior* hath said enough to *stay the stomach* of the scorner, and I hope in time he will *cast it up*. In order to which I shall indeavour (at my next time of leasure) to make him *hate* his constant *Fallacy*, *A rectè conjunctis ad malè divisa*, in his pleading for *sins* being *meerly privative*.

* See his *Pref. Epist prefixt to his Calvinists Cabinet Unlockt.*

I can very hardly hold back my hand from setting down *more* of his *assertions* concerning the sin of *hateing God*, and shewing the *manifold impieties*, of which his own words do prove him *guilty*. But having already too much exceeded the usuall bounds of a *Letter*, and made a greater *excursion* than I intended, I shall not speak of this subject,

ject, untill I shall do it *ex professo*, and *once for all*. It appeares by this *little* (thus *accidentally* spoken of) that Mr. *Hickman* will be apt to except against me, for having *stuck thus long on so sore a place*.

But what then can I do for the escaping of his *contempt*, wherewith he has threaten'd to entertain me? If I shall call him to account for what he hath written of *Risibility*, of the *intellect*, and the *will*, and the *subject of inhesion* to whatsoever either *proper* or *common accident*; and shall prove him a man of the greatest *ignorance* in the things of *Logick and Philosophy*, or the greatest *Contemner of God Almighty* in writing wilfully and studiously *against his Knowledge*, of any pretender to *Grace* or *Wit* that in all my life I ever heard of; and shall manifest that his *Trophies* are most ridiculously *erected* where his own *Misadventures* are most *remarkable*, as if he had purposely intended to make his *shame* the more *signal*, by *mocking* himself with an *Ovation* in being *worsted*; if (I say) I shall examine him concerning such things as these, he will be ready to cry out, that these are the *parts of his Discourse* which I ought not in mercy to meddle with, in regard of their being so *sick and weak*. So again if I *demonstrate* by many more than an *hundred conspicuous Instances*, that he hath *affixed* his *own name*, and so dishonestly *pretended* to be the *Author* of the *Wit* and *Language* of *other men*, (which any *Boy* might have done who was but able to *write* and *read*) and if besides I shall observe, how he hath not onely *not quoted* (or acknowledged with thanks) but bitterly *rayl'd* at some persons, out of whose writings he hath *stolne* both *words* and *matter*, notwithstanding the *Authors* are still *alive*, to give notice of his *robbery* and *railing* too, and to pursue the bold *Felon* with *Hue* and *Cry*, the man would certainly exclaim (at least in the presence of his Abettors) that I have *stuck like a flie upon very sore places*, and unmercifully *falu upon his sick and weak parts*. So well is he armed *cap a pe* by this one Declaration of his *Infirmities*.

The utter impossibility of escaping his Contempt.

And here it is pertinent to deplore the *sad estate* of this *Patient*,

The sad mark of a desperate Patient.

Jer. 15.18. *Patient*, being of kin to that *wound* which * *refuseth to be healed.* He is *conscious* to himself of having very *sore places*, and loudly *complains* to his *Physitian*, that there are *sick and weak parts* in the *body of his Discourse*; and yet he preferrs the *peccant humour* before the *pain* of being *cur'd*. To all the *rest* of his *maladyes* he hath added *this* also, that he is faln in *love* with his *Diseases*, and *hates* the means of his *recovery*. *Prosper* gives it as the character of an *unregenerate* and graceless man, *Quòd amat languores suos, & pro sanitate habet quòd agrotare se nescit, donec prima hac medela conferatur agroto, ut incipiat nosse quòd langueat, & possit opem Medici desiderare, quâ surgat.* We see the condition of him is sad, who does *not know* that he is sick; and is not *his* a great deal sadder, who proclaims his *sick and sore parts* with his utter *averseness* to have them *touch'd*? I find a Horse with a *gall'd back* is less difficult in the *dressing*, than such a *rigid Presbyterian* with a *gall'd Conscience* and a *gall'd Cause*. I did but *move* towards the *former* (I mean the gall'd *Conscience*) and point at it as with a finger, when yet he fell a *wincing* beyond all measure. Its true, I *rubb'd* the *later* (I mean the gall'd *Cause*) and so for his *biteing* I must not blame him. If at last he will stand fair, and indure a *dressing* of the *sore places* of which he warns me to stand aloof, (groaning sometimes, but never grumbling) I shal not scruple to warrant a *perfect cure*. At least by *abstersive* and *cleansing* medicines I shall hope to keep the *sore places* from *putrefaction*, that they may not infect his over-*easie* and *catching* Readers; who may really be in danger of the *contagious disease*, which hath been lately call'd *Rantism*, unless the *noysomness* and *stench* of his *sorest places* shall make them stand at a *wholsome distance*.

D. Prosperi *Resp. ad Capitul. Gallor. Ob.* 6. p. 310.

No remedies too rough in order to his Recovery.

I suppose, Sir, I need not desire *your pardon* for any *Roughness* in my *expressions*, though you are pleas'd in much humility to * desire *my pardon* for your *own*. Could I believe you had *offended* in your austerity to the *Scoffer*, I would not have followed your *example* in this prævious execution of *punitive Justice*. Whatever language you

* p. 192.

may

may have given him, I can easily justifie to all your *Censors*, that is, to all of his *incurable Scotized Sect*, (as our Reverend Dr. *Sanderson* hath very fitly * *characterized* them.) Its true, you call him a † *man of Brass*, but do you not *prove* him to be such, by his making you *worse than any Tinker*, when you had never so much as *named* him in any kind? Its true, you * compare him to the *Cuckowe*, but I know not how you could avoid it, when he had taxed you so unmannerly for *defiling your own Nest*, whilst he was laying his Ordures in other mens, and also guilty of the *rapacity* which there you mention. Its true, you admonish him of his † *Sacriledge*, but first you *prove* it, and you prove it out of his *mouth*. For when you had but accused him of a *lesser Robbery* in the Colledge than he *committed*, he *scoffed* at you for your mistake, and prov'd his *Robbery* to be *greater* than you *imagin'd*. Its true, you compare him to * *Æsops Dog in the Manger*, but *himself* had made the *resemblance* extremely *neer*; neither affording the *Archbishop* a good word himself, nor suffering others, without *snarling*, to do him right. Its true, you parallel his † *Railing* with his *Brother Burton's*, and affirm his *Language* to be † *libellous*, but you abundantly make it appear by that *Scandalum Magnatum*, of which I should think his very *Favourers* would find him *guilty*. And they would do it so much the rather, because (as you very well * observe) whilst he *excuseth* them of *Rapine*, he *condemns* them of *Perjury*. Nay if *Sennacherib* is affirmed in *Holy Writ* to have sent Letters to * *raile on the Lord God of Israel*, because he wrote against Gods *Omnipotence*, how very fitly may Mr. *Hickman* be said to have *railed* against the *same*, by teaching the people to believe, that *all things positive* (and *all Blasphemies* by consequence) *are either Creatures of God, or God himself*? For hath he not * expressly taught, that *in all wicked works* (such as the *hateing and cursing God*) *the works themselves are positive and from God, as all other positive things*, (such as the *loving* and *blessing God*?) And what is this but to *write against the purity of God*, with a pen as much *worse* then that of the Hearhen

* See his Preface to the last Edition of his first Sermons, *Sect.* 24. *p. ult.*

† *p.* 131.

* *p.* 132.

† *p.* 134, 135.

* *p.* 144.

†† *p.* 145. *p.* 191

* *p.* 133.

* 2 *Chron.* 32, 17.

* See *his p.* 96. *l.* 8, 9.

King *Sennacherib*, as it is more *puritanical*, and against *greater means of Light*? Its true, you charge him with † *slander* too, but so no doubt will his *Abettors*, if they will read what you have written. For (not to speak in this place of what he hath vented against *your self*) the *slander* he rais'd on the *Right honourable* and *most Reverend* Father in God, My *Lord* of *Canterbury his Grace*, you have evinced to be such out of his own *hand-writing*. And in stead of a *recantation* he hath dared to offer at an *Excuse*. But 'tis an excuse so *unexcusable*, that (as you have said very well) *it may justly render him contemptible to the silliest School-boy*. 'Tis so extravagant an impiety, to say of so wise, so learned, so great and holy a Divine, that *He was turned out of the Schooles*, that (to speak my opinion in your words) *the foulest mouth (except his) could never raise so lewd a slander*. Its true, you call him a * *Filcher*, and say *he hath made things his own, as some unhappy boyes make Knives when they do but steal them*. Could you have possibly done less, than to detect a *Robber* of such sturdiness, as that he thinks it a little thing to *take the purse*, unless he may fly in the very face of him that *follows the Hue and Crie*? If you had not known in what manner he plunder'd *other* mens Treasures, you had enough to prove against him for having rifled one of your *own*. One of the very *best pieces of wit and language* to which he hath put his own name, (in hope to injoy the honour of it for a season, till his works of darkness should come to light) he hath stoln *verbatim* from your *Antidotum Lincolniense*. Which I say so much the rather, because although in your late book you take some notice of the *stealth*, yet you name not the *Treasure* from whence the *Margarite* was *stoln*, (for *such* tis thought by those persons who think it *his*) and perhaps you knew not so well as I; at least I am sure I first observed it, meerly by dipping into the book without design. But whereas you say * *you are able to trace the steps of this young Serpent in all the cliffs and precipices of the Rock upon which he glideth, so as to follow him not onely in his proofs and Arguments, but many of his phrases and flourishes also*, some who are partial to

† p. 141.

* p. 184.

p. 150.

* p. 147, 148.

to the *Purloiner* do think you have done him great wrong; or at least they say what they do not think, that those are onely *Citations* which you are pleased to brand with the name of *stealths*. And truly the principal inducement to this my present Publication, is to *vindicate* your *Honour* in this particular, and to stop the mouths of the *Snarlers*, who speak so much either *against* or *without* their knowledge of the *Fact*; and who may say with as much reason, that *Achan* did not *purloyn*, but onely *borrow* the *wedge of Gold*; and that *Rachel* did no more than *take* the *Teraphims* of *Laban without his leave*, though she is *branded* in Scripture for having *stoln* them. Had Mr. *Hickman's whole book* been onely a *heap of Citations*, you would no more have condemn'd him in the notion of a *Filcher*, than you condemn Mr. *Prinn* for his *Anti Arminianism*, or *Grotius* himself for his *Annotations* on the *Gospels*, which are as *full* of *Citations* as can be wish'd, and much the better for such a * *Fulness*. But when you said that Mr. *Hickman had taken all his Arguments from Mr. Prinns Anti Arminianism and his Canterbury's Dooms-day*, (which had been long ago observed by many more than your self, who are minutely in a readiness to make an *ocular demonstration*) you fitly added that he did it *without acknowledging his Benefactor*, (that is to say in plainer English) *without citeing the places from whence he stole them*; for *stoln* them he had not, had those been *cited*. * p. 150.

Now Sir be pleas'd to take notice, that the *Filcher* (as you call him) deserves that name, in greater measure then you imagin. For as it appeares by a *Collection* lately put into my hands by a *Neighbour-Minister* (a person of very good note for life and Learning) whose exact notification both of the *pages* and of the *lines* is attested unto by my *Amanuensis*, (and for a great part of them mine eyes are witnesse) I say it appeares by that Collection, that not only *all* his ablest *Arguments* and *Proofes*, with some of his *flourishes* and *phrases*, (as you imperfectly discover) but even *all his flourishes* and *fancies*, *all his Sarcasmes* and *jeers*, *all his allusions* and *similes* which have any appearance

rance of ſmartneſs in them, yea *all his ſentences and phraſes which ſavour of Wit and Ingenuity*, are moſt ſhamefully and groſly (and *word for word* in *moſt* places, if not in *all*) tranſcribed by him in his *Hotch-Potch*, from a few of our *late Engliſh Writers*, whom he partly doth *not name*, and partly *rayle's at*, but *never once cites* for the things I ſpeak of.

Had he been but as honeſt as *Theodectes*, and owned other men's writings by a *grant* of *Liberty* from the *Authors*; or had he *commended* the proper *owners* with the *ſpoiles* of whoſe *Pens* he had been *enrich'd*, I think you would not have *ſhew'd* him in ſo naked a manner as you have done. But to *ſteal a Gooſe* (as the proverb ſpeakes) and *not to ſet up a feather*, or to *ſet it up* onely for a *Reproach* to the proper *owner*, did ſeem to *you* a greater *Crime*, than he could *ſafely* be ſuffer'd to *proſper in*. It is not certainly for nothing, that the word *Plagiary* ſhould ſignifie (in Claſſick writers) a *ſtealer of* other folkes *children*, and of other folkes *Wit*; the *fruit of the body*, and *of the brain*. And you know what grievous puniſhments were inflicted on the *former* by the *Flavian Law*. The fitteſt puniſhment for the *later*, and that which tend's moſt to the Malefactors *Reformation*, is (in the judgement of *Martial*) to *tell it out* among the people, and make the Plagiary *aſham'd*. It being probable that his *ſhame* will be *Gentleman-Uſher* to his *amendment*.

Mart. l. 1.

Hoc ſi terque quaterque clamitâris,
Impones Plagiario Pudorem.

And this I take to be the reaſon, why St. *Paul* took care with his *Theſſalonians*, that ſome ſinners ſhould be *noted, and as if it were *mark'd* with a black cole, and that to the end they might be * *aſhamed*. Beſides it ought to be conſidered, that a *looker on* may be † *acceſſary* to another mans *ſtealth*, by knowingly *concealing* his *ill gotten goods*. And when the very ſame perſon who is accuſed of a *Plagium*, is convicted at the ſame time of a *Peculatus*,

** Σημειοῦσθε —ἵνα ἐντρα-πῇ. 2 *Theſ.* 3. 14.

† *Pſal.* 50. 18.

Pœna peculatus (Furti ſcilicet pecuniæ Publicæ) inprimis fuit pecuniaria in Quadruplum, poſtea fuit deportatio.

(for

(for which his *Restitution* should be no lesse then *fourfold* as I have somewhere read in the *Civil Law*) I know not how you could do lesse, then draw up an *Indictment*, and I am bound to assist you to bring in *Evidence*.

But here I am in some strait what kind of course I shall take to make the *evidence irresistible*. Should I use that *brevity* which *you* thought best for your Readers *ease*, and nameing one or two *Proofs*, referr my Reader for all the rest to the severall Authors, (without a notification of *lines* and *pages*) I might suffer from the *incredulous*, as you have done in my hearing. And yet to give in an *Inventory* of all particulars in my *power*, were not onely in effect to *reprint the Rhapsody*, but *twice* at *once* to reprint it. Once, as I find it in Mr. *Hickman*; and again, as I find it in the true and just *owners*. To avoid *prolixity* on the one side, I shall *omit* the many passages which he hath taken *verbatim* out of the two *common store-houses*, Mr. *Prinn's Anti-Arminianism* and his *Canterburies Doom*; both because it would fill up some *whole sheets* of paper; and because it is matter of *many* mens talk and observation, as well as of mine and my neighbour-*Ministers*; and because you have already * assur'd your Readers, that from *thence he hath taken all his Arguments, except that of* Gabriel Bridges *and* Mr. *Simpson, and perhaps these also*: which in case Mr. *H.* shall adventure to deny, there are *many* who can *prove* it, besides *your self*. And yet on the other side to attain the chiefest end of my present writing, which is the *silencing* of *them* who open their mouthes for Mr. *Hickman*, and say you *wrongfully* represent him in the ugly *shape* of a *Purloiner*, I shall (as *briefly* as may be possible) give such a Catalogue of his *Gleanings*, as I suppose lesse obvious to *common notice*, and which I have reasons to believe hath escape'd your *own*. Onely my Catalogue shall *begin* with a signal instance of his *Audacity*, which however it hath not escap'd your notice, yet you name not the *Book*, much lesse the *page* where it is printed, nor do you set it so fully as now I shall. Next shall follow Mr. *Morrice*, because himself hath observed how his *Book* hath been *pilfer'd*. My method

* p. 150.

method shall be, to set the *Author* on the *right* hand, with the *Purloiner* on the *left*; observing the *pages* and *lines* of each; not *every* line, (for that would be troublesome, and needlesse too) but one or two at the most, by which it will be easie to find the rest.

Mr. Hickman.	Dr. Heylin.
Onely I will make bold to deal with *him*, as *Alexander* did with his *Bucephalus*, take *him* a little by the bridle and turn *him* to the Sun, that other men may see how *he* lay's about him, though *himself* will not. *Book*, p. 7 *l.* 19, 20.	*Onely I will make bold to deal with you as* Alexander *did with his* Horse Bucephalus, *take* you *a little by the bridle, and turn you towards the Sun, that other men may see how* you *lay about you, though* your self *do not*. Antidot. Lincoln. ch. 1. p. 5. l. 3. 4, &c.

Mr. *Morice* of *Werrington* his New Inclosures broken down.

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Morice.
The importunity of friends — the common Vouchée for publications. *Epist.* p. 1. *l.* 18, 19.	*The importunity of friends, the common vouchee* to warrant *publications*. Epist. p. 8. l. penult.
As did the *heathen* persecutors by the primitive Christians, *putting them* into beasts skins. *ib.* p. 2. *l.* 11.	*As the persecutors* lapt *the primitive Christians in beasts skins*. Book. p. 194. l. 5.
So coursely and undecently dealt with as I have been. *ib.* p. 9. *l.* 11.	*So coursely and indecently deal't with as I have been.* Preface. p. 22. l. 16.
Seasonable Counsell which Galba gave to Piso, Nero à pessimo quoque desiderabitur,	*Seasonable Counsel which Galba gave to Pico, Nero à pessimo quoq; desiderabitur,*

rabitur,

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Morrice.
rabitur, mihi & tibi providendum est, ne etiam à bonis desideretur. *ib. p.9. l. penult, &c.*	*mihi & tibi providendum est, ne etiam à bonis desideretur.* Book.p.93.l.29.30,&c.
Notwithstanding all *his* Bustle and Ratlings, impartial and judicious men *may* discerne, *he is* but like that Goth in Procopius, who though he fought fiercely, had the mortal Arrows sticking in his Helmet, whereof he soon after fell. *Book, p. 2. l.2, &c.*	*Notwithstanding all* their *Bustle and Ratling, impartial and judicious men* will *discerne*, they are *but like that Goth in Procopius, who though he fought fiercely, had the mortal Arrows sticking in his Helmet, whereof he soon after fell.* ib. p. 149. l.13,&c.
I am faln into an age in which I have learn'd to admire nothing, not so much from any knowledge I have attained unto, of the causes of things, as from *the multitude of strange effects.* Pref. p. 4.l.1 &c.	We are lapsed into an age, &c. (*and so forward, with some transposition, untill those words*) —— the multiplicity of strange effects. *Preface p. 11. l. 2, &c.*
That commune Dei hominumq; odium, Mr. *Hobbs. Book p.7.l.1, &c.*	*That communé odium Dei atq; hominum*, the Anabaptists. *Pref.p.19.l.19.*
As *Ithasius*, who *having* no other virtue but his hatred *to* the Priscillianists, &c. *ib. p.8.l.3, &c.*	*Like* Ithasius, *who* had *no other virtue but his hatred* towards *the Priscillianists.* Book.p.43.l.43,&c.
That I might wel say with *Jerome*, Qui non ignoscit ingenio, ignoscat tempori. *ib. p.16.l.antep.*	*That I might plead with* Jerome, *Qui non ignoscit ingenio, ignoscat tempori.* Pref. p.3.l.7.
A blasting of all graces, and an alloy to all endow-	*A blasting of all graces, or an alloy to all endowments,*

Dr. Heylin.	Mr. Monice.
ments; as if it might be sai'd of his opinion, as *Austine* speaks of discretion; Tolle hanc, & virtus vitium erit. *ib.p.17.l.18.&c.*	*as if it might be said of this, as* St. Augustine *speaks of discretion, Tolle hanc & virtus vitium erit.* Book p.159.l.31.
I have the thousand witnesses to attestate. *ib. p.22. l.12.*	*I have the thousand witnesses to attestate.* Pref.p.15. l.32.
The desires of my soul are to receive — a Prophet in the name of a Prophet, not as concurring with me, &c. *ib.p.22.l.13, &c.*	*I desire, to receive a Prophet, in the name of a Prophet, and not a concurrant, &c.* Book p.166.l.1.
My cordiall affections to — are as well known, as I my self am. *ib.p.22.l.18.*	*My affectionate respects, to — are as well known as I am.* ib. p.165.l.21.
To inodiate. *ib.p.22.l.26.*	For *inodiating.* ib. p.165. l.29.
Professe, as a precise and measured truth. *ib.p.23.l.18.*	*Professe* it, *as a precise and measured truth.* Pref.p. 9.l. 34.
Judgement often varieth with interest, and things acquire a *price*, not so much for what they are in themselves, as for what they are relatively to our ends and purposes, — no good money when he should take it, is currant coine when *he* should pay it. *ib.p.59.l.20, &c.*	*Judgement often varieth with interest, and things acquire* the *price, not so much for what they are* really *in themselves, as what they are relatively to our ends and* turns; — *no good money when* they *should take it, is currant coine when* they *should pay it.* ib.p.113.l.31.
An Essay of the Spartan's valour, who being struck down by a mortal blow, used to stop their mouthes with	*An Essay of the Spartan valour, who being struck down by a mortal blow, used to* stanch *their mouth* full earth,

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Morice.
earth, that they might not be heard to quetch or groan, thereby to affright their fellowes, or animate their enemies. *ib.p.3.l.6.*	*of earth, that they might not be heard to quetch or groan, thereby to affright their fellowes or animate their enemies.* ib.p.256.l.17,&c.
Cannot fall down and worship the idols, which these men have set up, they must expect to be thrown into the fiery furnace, nay they are tormented in it already in *Austine's* sense, who calls the *mouth of an angry adversary* by that name. *ib.p.31. l.15,&c.*	*Cannot fall down and worship the image, that — hath set up an occasion to bring me into the fiery furnace* (*as Saint* Augustine *calls an* adversaries angry mouth.) ib. p. 30. l. 8. *with* p.67.l.16.
Seeing the heat of these epidemicall controversies hath produced more writers, then (to use *Plautus* his *similitude*) an hot summer brings forth buzzing flies. *ib.p.* 107. *l.*24.	*When the heat of* those *epidemical controversies hath produced more writers, (to use* Plautus *his* comparison) *then an hot summer brings forth buzzing flies,* Pref.p.10.l.24.
Hath made a Coward fight for once. *ib.p.*108.*l.*1.	*Have made a Coward fight.* ib.p.11.l.pen.
Neither can I undergoe the judicious tryal of the learned, nor am I willing to hazard the passionate censures of the ignorant. *ibid p.*108.*l.*3.	*As I cannot undergoe the judicious trial of the learned, so I am not willing to hazard the passionate censures of the ignorant.ib.p.12. l.6.*
But if *his* reply shal be seasoned with the salt of *Momus*, not of *Mercury*: or if it be stuffed and coloured onely with an ignorantia	*But if* any *reply be seasoned nigro sale Momi non sale candenti Mercurii; or if they shall stuffe and colour it onely with an ignorantia*

Mr. Hickman.

Elenchi, defending that which is not impugned; or if he shal like *the* flies seek for, and stick onely upon a sore place, fal on the sick and weak parts of my discourse, and never attempt to charge through the main body, I shall vindicate my self onely with contempt and silence. *ib.p.*108.*l.*20.

Nor have I observed, that many have been healed by going into the troubled waters, though moved by the best Angels of the Church. *ib.p.*108.*l.*6,*&c.*

Nothing — which hath weight enough in it, to *turn those scales at* Sedan *of which* Capellus *saith*, that they *would break with the four hundreth part of a grain.* ib.p.68. *hot.*

Have the same quarrel with me, that *Fimbria* had with *Scævola*, because he did not totum telum in se recipere. *ib.p.*93.*l.*21,*&c.*

Who *drew the Scheme* of their opinions after that Bishop *Laud was Lord of the House.* And I think it no uncharitablenesse to say, that

Mr. Morice.

Elenchi,— *defending that which is not impugned*;— *shall like flies seek for, and stick onely upon a sore place, and falling upon the sick or* some single *parts of*— *without charging through the main body*; *I shall vindicate my self onely with contempt and silence.* Pref.p.25.l.29. & p.26.l.3.

Very few are healed by going into the troubled waters, though moved by the best Angels of the Church. ib. p.12.l.27.

They will not turn those very scales at *Sedan*, which Capellus tells us would break with the four hundreth part of a grain. Book p.153.l. antep.

Their quarrel against them like that of Fimbria *against* Scævola, *totum telum non recipit.* ib.p. 256.l. 17, &c. *Compare also* Pr.p.4.l.4. & B.p.292.l.27.

(*This is out of Mr.* Morice *exactly, the words only transposed*) *when* they draw the scheme of—, *they observe who are* Lords of the House, some

some of later times, *in making their judgments*, had very *great respect to the stars that were culminant. ib. p.25. l.6, &c.*

they have chief respect to the stars that are culminant, *and accordingly* make their judgment. Book p. 43. l. 11, &c.

There are many more Instances to be given in from Mr. *Morice*, which for brevities sake must be omitted.

Mr. John Goodwin. Triumviri.

Mr. Hickman.

Nonnulli citiùs volunt exagitare quod non intelligunt quàm quærere ut intelligant: & non fiunt humiles inquisitores, sed superbi calumniatores. *Aug. de Tem. Serm.72.*

Title-page.

Solent veritatis hostes suis jactantiis etiam de nihilo theatrum quærere. *Calvin. in Mar.9.14.* *ib.*

I cannot but recall what I have often read from *Gilbertus Cognatus*, of a man with an Ulcer in his face, who passing over a bridge, where the passengers were to pay a certain piece of mony for every malady of body found upon them, was required to pay the accustomed tribute

Mr. Goodwin.

Nonnulli intelligentes citiùs volunt exagitare quod non intelligunt quam quærere ut intelligant: & non fiunt humiles inquisitores, sed superbi calumniatores. Aug. de Temp. Serm.72.
Preface § 8. p. 11. in marg.

Solent veritatis hostes suis jactantiis etiam de nihilo theatrum quærere. Calvin. Harm. in Mar. 9. 14. *Book p.211. so p.194. marg.*

He calls to my remembrance a story reported from Gilbertus Cognatus, *of a man with an Ulcer in his face, who passing over a bridge, where the passengers were to pay a certain piece of mony for every malady of body found upon him, was required to pay the accustomed*

for

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Goodwin.
for the Ulcer in his face; but he refusing to pay it, the Officer pulls off his hat, intending to keep it for a pawn; his hat being taken off, another malady appears in his bald head; now Sir (saith the Officer) I must have a double tribute of you. Nay (saith the Traveller) that you shall not, and begins to struggle with the Officer: who being too strong for him, gave him a foyl, by means whereof there was a rupture perceived under his coat. Now (saith the Officer to him again) I must have a treble tribute of you. *Book p.* 106. *l. pen. &c.*	*tribute for that Ulcer in his face; but he refusing to pay it, the Officer pulls off his hat, intending to keep it for a pawn; his hat being taken off, another malady appears in his bald head: now Sir (saith the Officer) I must have a double tribute of you. Nay (saith the traveller) that you shall not, and begins to struggle with the Officer; who being too strong for him, gave him a foyle, by meanes whereof there was a rupture perceived under his Coat: Now (saith the Officer to him again) I must have a treble tribute of you.* ibid p. 225. l. 6.
Truth is so lovely and beautiful, that they who imbrace falshood, will needs have it to be truth: and because they are unwilling to be deceived, they will not be convinced that they have been deceived. *ib. p.* 108. *l.* 10.	*Truth is loved, but upon such terms, that whosoever loves that which is otherwise will needs have this to be truth: and because they are unwilling to be deceived, they will not be convinced that they have been deceived.* *Sic amatur veritas, ut quicunq; aliud amant, hoc quod amatur velint esse veritatem: & quia falli nollent, nolunt convinci quod falsi sunt.* Aug. Confes. l. 10. c. 23. *Pref. Sect.* 64. *p.* 105. *l.* 10.

Debasing

Mr. Hickman.

Debasing me to the dunghil of doctisme. *Pref. p.* 1. *l.* 5.

Δικῶ μὲν τὸ * ἰγκαλῶν ἐτόγης, εἶτα ἀκαθάρτου δυῖδον εἰς * ἰγκαλῶ μέγιστον εἶναι καὶ τῆς διακαθομένου ἀκχίστου. Plut. *Book p.* 24. *marg.*

At whose name Mr. *P.* is wont to rise up in an * *extasie*, of adoration. *ib. p.* 27. *l.* 27.

Rhetorick dropt from his pen in the absence of judgment and conscience. *ib. p.* 3. *l.* 3.

He hath alwayes a flood of vilifying words at command, and if he meet with a hard and stubborn argument, he soaks it in that liquor so long, &c. *ib. p.* 75. *l.* 14.

Having with the Badger bitten till his teeth meet, he lets go. *ib. p.* 13. *l.* 4. *a fin.*

Was there ever a man *ab orbe condito. ib. p.* 13. *l. pen.*

The best crowers are not alwayes the best fighters. *ib. p.* 90. *l. antep.*

Resolving— never more to come so near him, untill his breath be sweeter. *ib. p.* 106. *l.* 24.

Mr. Goodwin.

Abaseth me to the dunghil of doctism. Book p. 211. l. 3.

Δικῶ μὲν τὸ * ἰγκαλῶν ἐτόγης, εἶτα ἀκαθάρτου δυῖδον εἰς * ἰγκαλῶ— μέγιστον εἶναι καὶ τῆς διακαθομένου ἀκχίστου. *Plut.* ib. p. 168. marg.

At the sound of whose name— are wont to rise up in an * extasie *of veneration.* ib. p. 95. l. 27.

Composed by the Rhetorick of— in the absence of his judgment and conscience. ib. p. 60. l. 7.

Compare this with Pref. p. 27. Sect. 16. l. 13. *and* 24. *ending in these words —steeping it thoroughly in this liquor.*

With the Badger he hath bitten til his teeth meet, & now *he lets go.* Book p. 210. l. 21.

There was never such— ab orbe condito. ib. p. 210. l. 26.

The greatest crowers are not alwayes the best cocks of the game. Pref. p. 29. Sect. 16. l. 5. a fin.

Resolution, not to come any more so near him, untill his breath be sweeter. Book p. 371.

Who

Dr. Francis White. Way to the True Church, *Edit.* 1614. 4°.

Mr. Hickman.	Dr. White.
Who (*Memnon*) hearing a mercenary souldier with many bold and impure reports exclaim against King *Alexander*, lent him a blow with his Launce, saying, that he had hired him to fight against *Alexander*, and not to rail. *Book p.* 17.	Memnon, *when a certain mercenary souldier did with many bold and impure reproches exclaim against Great* Alexander, *lent him a blow with his Launce, saying, that he had hired him to fight against* Alexander, *and not to rail.* Epist. to Read. bot. of p.

The (reputed) Bishop of *Lincolne*. The Holy Table *Name* and *Thing*.

Mr. Hickman.	Bishop *of* Lincolne.
This poor fellow makes himself an adversary out of his own fancy, and driving him before him from one end of the Book to the other, shoots all his arrowes at this man of ugly clouts of his own framing. *Book, p.* 21. *bot.*	*This poor fellow makes himself an adversary out of his own phantasie, and driving him before him from one end of the Book to the other, shoots all his arrowes at this man of clouts of his own rearing.* Ch. 1. p. 2. l. 9, &c.
Hath so slipt and glided into all the several parts of his Book, that it is almost impossible to refute them without committing as many tautologies, as he himself, &c. *ib. p.* 89. *l.* 2, *&c.*	*Having slipt and glided — into all the several parts of this Libell, so as it is impossible to refute them without committing as many Tautologies as he useth himself.* ib. ch. 3. p. 60. l. 20.
I must therefore fall a picking of them up like so	*I must therefore fall a picking of them up, like so* many

many daisies in a bare common, here and there one where I can find them. *ib.l.*7.

Tumble in his ugly tropes, and rowle himself in his rayling eloquence. *ib.p.*4.*l.*9.

Mentis aureæ verba bracteata. *Pref* (1.*Edit.*) *p.* 31. *l.*10.

many daisies in a bare common, here and there one where I can find them. ib.p.61.l.4.

Tumble in your tropes, and roll in your Rhetorick, ib. p.77.l.19.

Mentis aureæ verba bracteata. ib.ch. 2.p.59.l. 11.

Philophilus Parrhesiales. Enthusiasmus Triumphatus.

Mr. Hickman.

Concerning the story out of Acosta touching the Peruvian Doctor of Divinity, who would affirm, that he should be a King and a Pope: The Apostolical See being translated to those parts; *See Book p.*45.*l.*17,*&c.*

Philophilus Parrhesiales.

This story we have at large in the above-mention'd Treatise, p. 38, 39. *Wherein some of the words are — that he would affirm that he should be a King, yea and a Pope too, the Apostolical See being translated to those parts.*

Now (Sir) however it may suffice for your vindication, that Mr. *Hickman* is thus evinced to have *wrapp'd* his *own Talent* (if he hath any) in a *Napkin*, and to have *swagger'd* for a time by *spending freely* on others men's; and though I shall purposely *omit*, to send you the *many* and *large* passages, which you know he hath plunder'd from Mr. *Prinn*, even because they are so very *many*, and withall so very *large*, that to *recite* them would make a Volume; yet to the end you may be able to grasp them all at one view, and to find them with ease, if need require; I shall briefly set down a Directory both to the *pages* and to the *lines*.

Mr. Prinne. *Canterburie's Doome.*

Mr. Hickman.	*Mr. Prinne.*
Concerning the English Jesuite's Book inscribed a Direction to be observed by N.N. See *Epist. Ded. p. 6. l. 3, &c.* along for 2. pages.	*Ibid p.* 114. *l.* 1. so on to the end.
Concerning Bishop *Montagues* Visitation-Articles; See *Pref. p. 3. l. 3, &c.* along for about 16. lines.	*Ibid p.* 177. *l.* 4. so on to the end.
Concerning Bishop *Lindsey.* See *ib. p.* 10. *l.* 5, *&c.* along for about 11. lines.	*Ibid p.* 360. on to the end.
Concerning the Church of England's (supposed) holding the Pope to be Antichrist. See *ib. p.* 11. *l.* 4, *&c.* along for several lines.	*Ibid p.* 542. *l.* 28. & 278. *bott.* & 276. *l.* 38. *ib. l.* 17. & *p.* 275. *l.* 24.
Concerning Dr. *Abbot's* Sermon at St. *Peter's.* See Book. *p.* 65. *l.* 8. along for 34. lines.	*Ibid p.* 155. *l.* 24. so on to end. See also *p.* 410, 411. *ib.*
Concerning the Jesuite's Letter to the Rector at Bruxells. See *ib. p.* 63. *l.* 20. along for about 11. lines.	*Ibid p.* 159. *l.* 39. so on to the end.
Concerning the Historical Narration, &c. intituled to *Cerberus*, and *Champneys.* See *ib. p.* 18. *l.* 14. along for 43. lines.	*Ibid p.* 167. *l.* 37. *&c.* & 168. *l.* 38, *&c.* & *p.* 169. *l.* 35. & 170. *l.* 17, *&c. ib. l.* 39. & *p.* 508. *l.* 7. *a fin.*
Concerning Dr. *Holland's* (pretended) turning Dr. *Laud* out of the Schooles, upon	*Ibid p.* 389. *l.* 20, *&c.*

the

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Prinne.
the score of Presbytery. See *ib.p.*23.*l.*19,*&c.*	
Concerning Archbishop *Laud's* Letter to Bishop *Hall* about Presbytery, and the forrain Churches. See *ib. p.*24.*l.*1. along for 10. lines.	*Ibid p.*274.*l.*22. so on to the end.
Concerning Episcopacy being an Order, or degree, in Bishop of *Exon's* Letter. See *ib.l.*15.	*Ibid p.*275.*l.*25,*&c.*
Concerning Images (pretended to be) forbidden in our times by the *Homilies* See *Pref.p.*8.*bot.* The Image of God the Father,*&c.*along for 7. lines.	*Ibid p.*102.*l.*7, *&c.* Who in this window had made no lesse then 7, &c. so on to the end,& *ib.l.*24, *&c.* The image of God the Father, *&c.* so on to the end, and *p.* 103.*l.*18, *&c.*
Concerning Mr. *Sherfield's* case. See *ib.* For taking down a glasse window, *&c.* along for about 6. lines.	*Ibid p.* 103.*l.* 11, *&c.* so on to the end.
Concerning a Gentleman's telling Mr. *Hickman* of the Archbishop's justifying the picturing of God the Father,*&c.* See *ib.p.*9. along for about 5. lines.	*Ibid p.* 147. *l.* 28, *&c.* From, An Renati, &c. on to the end.
Concerning Mr. *Palmer* of *Lincoln*-Colledge being coursely handled by the Regius P. and called Appellator, &c. for citing Bishop *Montague's* Appeal,&c, Concerning Mr. *Damport.* See *p.*45.*l.*8, *&c.* along for about 14. lines.	

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Prinne.
Concerning Mr. *Pym's Report* to the Commons about Mr. *Montague's* appeale. See *ib.p.*24.*l.* 1, *&c.* That he had disturbed the peace of the Church. *&c.* along for 10. lines.	*Ibid. p.* 158.*l.*41, *&c.* i That he had disturbed, &c. so on to the end.
Concerning the Commons Declaration about the sense of the English Articles of Religion. See *ib.l.* 16, *&c.* along for 12. lines.	*Ibid. p.*163.*l.*18, *&c.* We the Commons, &c. so on to the end.
Concerning Mr. *Montague's* Appeale almost strangled in the wombe, and such as wrote against it. See *ib. p.*23.*l.*14, *&c.*	*Ibid.p.*157.*l.*15. &c. *p.*159. *l.*20, *&c. ib.l.*7, *&c.*
Concerning Dr. *Bray's* expunging a clause against worshipping of Images ta'ne out of one of the Homilies, out of Dr. *Featlye's* Sermons. See. *ib.p.* 10. *l.*18, *&c.*	*Ibid. p.*108.*l.*25, *&c.*
Concerning the calling-in of Dr. *Downhams* Book of perseverance. See *p.* 47. *l. pen. &c.*	*Ibid. p.* 171.*l.*30, *&c.*
Concerning the censure of Mr. *Ford, Thorn, Hodges.* See *ib.*	*Ibid.p.*174.*l.*175.

Mr. Prinne,

Mr. Prinne. Anti-Arminianism.

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Prinne.
Concerning Dr. *John Bridges's* Book called a Defence of the Government, &c. and about his opinion, that falling away is not grounded on our 16. Article. See *Pref. p.*45. *l. antep.*	*Ib. p.*202. *l.*8. *&c.* See also *p.*6. *l.*23. *&c.*
Concerning *Tyndall's*, *Frith's*, *Barnes's* works preserved, put forth by *John Day*, and prefac'd by Mr. *Fox*. See *ib. p.*13. *l.*19, *&c.*	*Ib. p.*79. *l.*3, *&c. ib. l.*18. *and ib. l.*20.
Concerning Bishop *Ponet's* Catechism imposed by K. *Edw.* 6. on all Schools. See *ib. p.*16. *l.*13. *&c.*	*Ib. p.* 48. *l.* 31, *&c. see just before two leaves of the said Catechism, from f.* 37. *to f.* 41. *see ib. p.* 48. *l.* 28, *&c.*
Concerning Questions and Answers about Predestination at the end of the Old Test. of *Rob. Barkers* Bible. See *ib. p.*17. *l.*16.	*Ib. p.*51. *l.*1, *&c. and p.*54. *l.*6, *&c.*
Concerning the English Articles agreed, confirm'd, &c. in several Reigns. See *ib. p.* 14.	*Ib. p.* 4.
Concerning Dr. *Jackson's* Questions in *Vesper*; and concerning Dr. *Frewen's* Questions. See *ib. p.*28. *l.*28. *&c.*	*Ib. p.* 249. *l.* 12. *and p.* 250. *l.* 11, *&c.*
Concerning Bishop *Carletons* saying, That albeit the Puritans troubled the Church	*Ib. p.*262. *l.*18. *and p.*263. *l.*7. *ib. l.*16.

about

about Discipline, yet they did not so about Doctrine. See Book *p.*42.*l.*7.*&c.*	
Concerning the University of *Cambridge's* Letter to the Chancellour for suppressing of *Baro's* Opinions. See *p.*66. *l.*18, *&c.*	*Ib. p.* 256. *l.* 18, *&c. see p.*253.*l.*27, *&c. and p.*256. *l.*18.
Concerning our Articles being Anti-Arminian, because composed by such as were disciples of *Bucer* and *Martyr*. See *Pref. p.*18. *l.*6. *&c.*	*Ib. p.* 12. *l.* 3, *&c.*
Concerning K. *James's* hard words of the Remonstrants. See *Book p.* 39. *l.* 5. *&c. ib. l.*11. *&c.*	*Ib. p.*214. *and p.*205.*l.*26, *&c. and* 206. *l.*3, *&c. see also p.*89.*l.*13.

Having thus far discovered the *greater Rapines*, it will cost me no labour to adde the lesser; which yet I would not have done, but that they are put into my hands by the *Neighbour-Minister* I spake of, who thinks they may *follow*, though they might not *lead*. *One* Lock of *Wool* doth not merit a consideration, but *many* of them put together will make a *Todd*; and you know who was *slain* for an *accumulative Treason*.

Mr. Hickman.	Dr. Heylin.
Non partis, &c. *Advertisement fin.*	*Non partis, &c.* Preface to Exam. Histor: fin.
Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Morice.
Book p.14.l.4, &c.	*Book p.* 218. *l.*15, *&c. see also Pref. p.*25.*l.*28.
Ibid.p.36.l.*penult.* &c.	*Ibid.p.*252.*l.*10, *&c.*
Ibid.p.58.l.*antep.* &c.	*Ibid. p.* 35. *l.* 24, *&c. and p.*42.7, *&c.*
Ibid.p.105.l.22.	*Ibid.p.*233.*l.*11. *Pref.p.*1. *l.*6. *ib.p.*26.*l.*27.

Pref.

Preface p.39.l.1.	*Ibid.p.79.l.37.*
Book p.13.l.19.	*Ibid.p.64.l.11.*
Ibid.p.89.l.5. *à fin.*	*Ibid.p.128.l.4, à fin.*
Ibid.p.2.l.11, &c. outface their defeats.	*Ibid.p.217.l.29, &c. outfaced their defeat.*
Pref.p.7.l.*pen.*	*Ibid.p.258.l.6.* sic alibi semel.
Book p.60.l.2.	*Ibid.p.211.l.29.*

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Goodwin.
Preface p.39.l.1,&c.	*Preface p.24.l.17.*
Book p.71.l.8.	*Ibid.p.94. Sect.46.l.15. so p.98.Sect.59.l.21.*
Ibid.p.7.l.14.	*Ibid.p.110. Sect.66. l.23. so Book p.20.l.27.p.134.l.4* à fin. *p.194.*
Ibid.p.84.l.5.	*Book p.108. l.10. p.110. l.* antep. *p.114. l.7. p.123. l.19. p.136. l.32. p.189. l.25.*
Pref.p.l.5. *à fin.*	*Ibid.p.211.l.11.*

Mr. Hickman.	Mr. Prinne's Doom.
Pref.p.4.l.7.	*Ibid.p.106.l.ult,&c.*
Ibid.p.46.l.*pen.*	*Ibid.p.156.l.22.*
Ibid.p.47.l.19.	*Ibid.p.171.*

Mr. Hickman.	Anti-Arminianism.
Ibid.p.16.l.5.	*P.21,22.*
Ibid.p.16.l.11.	*Ibid.p.27,&c.*
Ibid p.38.l.19.	*Ibid p.93.l.9,11.13.*
Ibid p.18.l.11.	*Ibid p.86.l.9,&c.& p.96. l.12,&c.*
Ibid p.43.l.16.& l.25.	*Ibid p.97.l.5.*
Ibid p.33.l.5,&c.	*Ibid p. 89. l.22, &c.* In Marg. *Fenlye's* Pelag. Rediv.*cited.See p.98.l.10,&c.*
Ibid p.31 *top.*	*Ibid p.204.l.35.& p.205. bot.*

Ibid.

Ibid.p.25.l.13.& l.16.	*Ibid.p.* 252. *l.*6. & *l.*11. & *p.*271.bot.
Ibid.p.46.l.*ult.*& p.47.l.1.	*Ibid.p.*246 *l.*22.& *p.*247. *l.*16.& *p.*250.bot.
Ibid.p.22.l.11.	*Ibid.p.*271. bot. *See also Epist.to Parl.p.*11.l.12.
Book p.19.l.12.	*Ibid.p.*85.*l.*24.
Ibid.p.35.l.7.	*Ibid.p.* 93.*l.* 16.& *p.* 100. *l.*17.
Pref.p.43.l.8,&c.	*Ibid.p.* 90. *l.*21.& *p.*7. *l.*12.& *p.*9.*l.*19,&c.

Now, Sir, if any of these *figures* shall come imperfectly into your hands, by any oversight of the *Printer*, or ill correcting of the *Presse*, be pleas'd to remember what now I say, that *every one* of the *Citations* have been strictly compared by several witnesses *apart*. And if any thing be *amiss* through inadvertency in the conveyance, the *Collector* in an instant can set it *right*. That some of these are *Quotations* either of Latin or Greek Authors, is well *consider'd* by the *Collector*, who therefore hath not accused Mr. *Morice*, or Mr. *Goodwin*, for having *fetch't* them from their several *Fountains*, (he rather gives them his *Commendation*) but he accuseth Mr. *Hickman* of having *filtch'd* them out of the *Cisternes*, (and you know who saith, *stolne waters are sweet*,) without acknowledging the *Cisternes*, to which they are evidently *due*, (as may appear by his *formes* of *Introduction*, his way of *rendring*, and *applying*, besides his *Robberies verbatim*, before, and after,) and pretending vainly to have drank from the Christall *Spring*. Its true he *varies* from Mr. *Goodwin* in two particulars of Remarke. For whereas Mr. *Goodwin* hath truly written out of *Plutarch*, ἰγκλῆν, and ἰγκαλῶ, * Mr. *Hickman* most grossely thought fit to write thus, ἰκκαλῆν, and ἰκκαλῶ. Of this I should not have taken such publick notice, had he committed the fault but *once*, or had he put it in the *Errata*, or had he mended the matter in his *second Edition*. But since it hath passed with him for currant in *both Edi-*

* Book p.14. in Marg.l.2.& 7.

tions of his *Farrago*, I judge he meant to *correct* Mr. *Goodwins Greek*; and so I may better say of *him*, then he of *you*, he hath but done like some *Tinkers*, who in stopping *one hole*, are wont to *make many*. That Mr. *Goodwin* was his *Plutarch*, you may conjecture even from hence, that amongst many other things of which I have given you an account, he hath illustriously stoln in *one place* no less than *twenty good lines together, word for word from* Mr. *Goodwin*, although in case of no greater moment, then the *telling* and *applying* a *pretty tale*. And therefore in that he saith, [*he hath often read from Gilbertus Cognatus*] his meaning infallibly must be this, *that he hath often read in* Mr. *Goodwins* Triumviri, *what* Mr. *Goodwin hath related from Gilbertus Cognatus*; he having managed the story, not in the words of *Gilbertus Cognatus*, but in the words and phrases of Mr. *Goodwin*. Instead of his *Thanks* to Mr. *Goodwin* for *that* and many more *Favours*, (which Mr. *G.* hath done him without his knowledge) he brand's him with *Vanity*, and *Arrogance*, and *Impudence* hardly to be *equall'd*, and Intitle's him *the Ishmael in Coleman street*. And in a manner not much unlike, he hath requited your self for the *credit* he got by *stealing* from you, however he *lost* it by your *Discovery*; and is now to *lose more*, through the very *same meanes* by which he *gain'd* it.

* *Postscript p.* 1

During the space of some *months*, he made a *shew* in the world, and was thought (by some of his party) to have had a good *stock* of *Wit*, and *Learning*. But full well is it known to *your self* and *others*, how *poor a writer* he would be, if *every man* had his *own*. It was not onely unworthily, but *cruelly* done in Mr. *Hickman*, (like the Tyrant *Mezentius*) to joyne the *living* with the *Dead*. For if you take away the *Lively* and *florid* things which he hath *stolen*, there will nothing be found to be his *own*, except the *putrid* and *noysome Carkasse*. I may say of Mr. *H.* as our Reverend Doctor *Walton* hath lately said of his *Considerator*, applying the words of *Apollodorus* to *Chrysippus his writings*; *take away* τὰ ἀλλότρια, *whatsoever is not his own*, κενὸς αὐτῷ ὁ χάρτης, *his paper will be empty and void of*

 matter.

matter. For words of Calumny and Railing must passe for *wind*. *Prometheus* could make a *man* of *Dirt*, and that *Minerva* allow'd him to call his *own*; but even the *Poets* would not suffer him to wear the honour of a *Creator*, because the *Life* of his workmanship was cunningly *stolen* from the *Sun*; and he was punish'd for his impiety by *all* the *Ills* that brake forth of *Pandora's Box*.

Hesiod. ἔργ. καὶ ἡμερ. βιβ. α.

Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔκρυψε, χολωσάμενος ὃ ὁ ἐν θυμῷ,
Ὅτι μιν ἐξαπάτησε Προμηθεὺς ἀγκυλομήτης.

And however Mr. *Hickman* may have *laugh'd* for a season, (as *Prometheus* * did untill detected,) yet I am not sure that he will ever laugh *more*, unlesse it be with a *Sardonick Laughter*; or at least hath attain'd to that worst of Faculties, which is to *hug* his own *Misery*, as well as *Guilt*.

* Χαίρεις πῦρ κλέψας, καὶ ἐμὰς φρένας ἀπατήσας; *Ib. ver.* 55.

——Πάσω κακὸν, ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες
Τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμὸν, ἑὸν κακὸν ἀμφαγαπῶντες.

Had he timely considered the Roman * Proverb, that *the longest play-dayes will have an end*, he would a little have suspended his *Mirth* and *Boasting*, for fear of heaping up a Treasure of *shame* and *sorrow*. Out of how *many* mens *Gardens*, how many *Flowers* hath he *transplanted*, to try how happily they would live amongst the weedes of his *Dunghill*? When in his *Tenpenny trifle* (as you rightly terme it) I observed strange *Mixtures* of stile and matter, methought I found my self assaulted (like Bishop *Hall* by *Smectymnuus*) with a kind of polykephalous *Lernaan Monster*. But little at *first* did I expect, that Dr. *Heylin*, and Mr. *Morice*, and Mr. *Goodwin*, and Mr. *Prinn*, (much lesse that Bishop *White*, and the reputed Bishop of *Lincolne* should be conjur'd up out of their *Graves*,) and made to write against *me* in the name of *Hickman*; much lesse yet could I imagin, that they should all be compell'd *without* their *knowledge*, (and *some* I am sure *against their wills*)

* Non semper erunt Saturnalia.

wills) to *fill up the* * *measure* of Mr. *Hickmans name*, which you observe to betoken *a man of scorn*, or one who *sits* down in the *Scorners Chaire*, yet I observed diverse things, which did *alienam olere officinam*, whilst yet I *knew not* from whence he had them. And as there are who are examin'd how they *come* by their Estates, when they are seen to *spend freely*, however of a *late*, and a *low* beginning; so I employ'd a worthy Person (whose Love I knew would make him stoop to so meane an office) in making a very short *Search* into some English *Store-houses*; and so to try if my *suspicion* were not very well *grounded*. That if his *Drolery* was his *own*, I might afford him the more of my affection and respect, for having so *handsomely abus'd* me in diverse places. Or that if it were *stoln* (which I exceedingly suspected) I might so far endeavor to make a *Discovery* for his *good*, as it should happen to be for his *humiliation*. What account my Friend gave me, (the Neighbour-Minister I spake of) in how *many* strange *instances*, and in how very *few daies*, I hardly dare tell you, for fear it should seem a thing *incredible*.

* Maxime, qui tanti mensuram nominis imples, &c. *Ovid. Trist.*

Well fare Mr. *Hickman* for one good turn, I mean for *putting* me in *mind* of what I might otherwise have *forgotten*, as having learnt it long agoe in the *Grammar School*. I meane the *Apologue* of the *Crow*, which had sliely *impt* his own *wings* with many *other Birds Feathers* of *various colours*, and so had pass'd (for some time) as one of the *Beauties* of the great *Volary*. But when his *thievery* was *discover'd*, and every Bird that had been defrauded began to challenge his *own Feathers*, then the poor *Crow* would fain have *flown out of himself* (at least by wishing it had been possible) to escape the contempt of the *other Birds*, which now came purposely to behold him in his own *Naturall Deformity*. And may I not say of Mr. *Hickman*, (what his *Saucinesse* * adventur'd to say of the Reverend Dr. *Heylin*) that *he is a Bird of the same Feather*? May I not *liken* him to the *Crow* in this *one* respect, as you your self in *another* have fitly resembled him to the * *Cuckow*? Sure if all above cited shall *deplume* and denudate this *Bird of*

* *Pref. p.* 522

* *p.* 132, 134.

Prey, by taking from *him* but as much as he took from *them*, he will remain as unhandsom as *Æsop's Crow*. Methinks Mr. *Hickman* appeares in *prose* as filtching *Celsus* appear'd in *verse*, when *Horace* spake of him to *Julius Florus*.

Horat. Epist. l. 1. Ep. 3.

Quid mihi Celsus agit? monitus, multumq; monendus,
Privatas ut quærat opes, & tangere vitet
Scripta, Palatinus quæcunque recepit Apollo:
Ne si forte suas repetitum venerit olim
Grex Avium plumas, moveat Cornicula Risum
Furtivis nudata coloribus.——

Tiber. Donat. in vitâ Virgil. p. 9. 10.

Bathyllus was to be shent, for taking upon him to be the Author of *Virgils Distich*, though *Virgil* himself had *never own'd* it. How much more is Mr. *Hickman*, for taking upon him to be the Author of *such Conceipts*, as your self and many others had put your *Names to*? Sed nemo gratis malus est. *Bathyllus*, for a time, got the favour of *Augustus* by *Virgils Distich*. But when *Virgil* appear'd against him with an

Hos ego versiculos feci, tulit Alter Honorem,
Sic vos non vobis Vellera fertis Oves,

Nothing in Rome was so *ridiculous* as the late celebrated *Bathyllus*. Thus it hath fared with Mr. *Hickman*; who by his *Predatory Pen* and by railing at the *Archbishop* procur'd an *ill gotten fame* from the little people of his pitch, who cannot distinguish a *Linsy-wolsy* from an entire piece of *cloth*. But the *young Serpent* (as you call him by way of *Simile*) will now be a *hissing* even to *them*, who applauded his *hissing* at his *Superiors*. And as his *Partisans* have *boasted*, that *he hath laid the Arminians upon their backs*; so they will grieve at least as much, to see him *creeping* upon his *belly*.

It hath been *bruited* far and wide by certain *thorow-pac'd Presbyterians* (as the most moderate Dr. *Sanderson* hath

fitly

fitly term'd them) that I am the Author of a Book, which they were pleas'd to intitle [*A dark room for* Mr. *Hickman*] and they have labour'd to make it *credible*, as well by *word*, as by *Epistle*, from *Northamptonshire* to *London*, and thence to *Oxford*. But whether the Copies were brought up before I was able to *hear* of any, or whether (which I suspect) there was *never* any such thing, (save in the *fancies* and *mouthes* of the *Presbyterians*,) sure I am, I am as free from being the *Author* of any such *Title*, much less of any such *Book*, as Mr. *Hickman himself* can be thought to be. I cannot reproch any man living with *bodily distempers*, or with *infirmities* of the *mind* which he cannot help. No friend of Mr. *Hickman's* can wish him more then I shall do, *mentem sanam in corpore sano*. It is my duty to convince him of all his *scandalous offences*, in as publick a manner as he *commit's* them. But with his *guiltless frailties*, or his *misfortunes not to be help'd*, I have never once medled in any kind.

Had I not known that this *invention* was sent to *London* in a *Letter*, by one and the same *Presbyterian*, who took some care to have it thought, that I had published a *Defence of women's painting*, in a Book intitled [*Of Auxiliary Beauty*,] and from whom I have reason to believe I have suffer'd *more*, then from the *hastinesses* and *heates* of my *quondam*-Enemy Mr. *Barlee*, whose *credulity* was but abus'd by such *underhand-dealers* as *this* I speak of; I should have thought that Mr. *Bagshaw* had been the *Master* of the *Mint*. Who, (how perfectly soever a *stranger* to me, and a person upon whom I had never so much as bestow'd a *thought*, much less an unkind or uncivil *word*) hath twice *reviled* me from the *Press* in as barbarous a manner, as such a person may be supposed. When first he *nibbled* at my *name*, and did *but nibble* at my *writings*, I can truly say that I had never *heard* of him; it was beside my knowledge, that there had ever been any such thing in *nature* as *Edward Bagshaw M. A. and student of Christ-church*. Not is it likely his *printed* Sermons would have come to my *notice*, as they did, if it had not been for their *Dedication*. I knew my *Bookes* were none of the *first*, whose outward *leaves*

had

had been *bitten* with *Rats* and *Mice*. Nor did I think that such *vermin* deserv'd mine *Anger*, for meerly doing *after their kind*, I should rather have rejoyced in that *Diversion*, could it have kept them from nibling at *better things*. But it seemes Mr. *Bagshaw* was so desperately *bent* to be *known* for *something*, and took it so very much to *heart*, that I would not be moved at his *abuses*, (as if I had done him a great *injury* by *not* returning him evil for evil, and had *not* been to be *indured* for resolving to suffer in *peace* and *silence*,) that he determin'd to use me *worse*, for having *suffer'd* so *much wrong*, than he had formerly us'd me for *doing none*. But being destitute of an *occasion* to wreak his Malice upon a Man, who would not gratifie him so far as to *yield* him *any*, he resolv'd for once to lay aside *modesty*, and *manners*, and *humanity* it self, to depositе the consideration of *God* and *Conscience*, and *judgement to come*, and so to set forth a *Narrative* against *his Master*, Mr. *Busby*, (whom he had *injur'd* too *highly* to be able to *forgive*,) that so in a *Preface* to his *Narrative* he might give himself *ease* upon Mr. *Pierce*.

And here I am confident you are wondring, (before you read me quite through) with what kind of *colour* or *pretense* he could indite such a *Preface* to such a *Narrative*. How he could *enter* into *Scurrility* on no occasion; and against a person, with whom he had never any *Commerce*, and by whom he had *never* been provoked, by *word*, or *writing*. Truly his *colour* was no more plausible, then a perfectly *Occasionless* and *Groundless Falshood*. He tells his *Reader* with as much confidence of Mr. *Pierce his Reflections on his Discourse*, as if he verily *believ'd* there was *great reason* for it, whilst yet he does not attempt to give his Reader the very *least*. It seemes he hath absolutely *Decreed*, that I shall be taken to be the *Author* of the *Calvinists Cabinet unlock'd*, lately published in *Defense* of *Tilenus Junior*, against the medlings of Mr. *Baxter*. In the Conclusion of which Book, I find indeed some *Reflections* on Mr. *Bagshaw's two Sermons*, shewing the *shallowness* and the *danger* both of the *one*, and the

the *other*. I mean the danger of the *Doctrin*, and the shallownes of the *reasoning* with which he hath labour'd to defend it. In the *beginning* of those Reflections, *one* is made upon his *Practice*, to which the *lowdness* of his *Principles* might seem to lead him. But what was this to Mr. *Pierce*, who was no more the *Author* of *Tilenus* his *Apology*, then of his *Examination before the Triers*? The Author of the *Apology* was doubtless the Author of the *Reflexions*; and very confident I am, that the Author of both was *Tilenus Junior*: who is *meant* by *Tilenus*, or where he *live's*, or who was the Author of the *Apology*, or who of the *Reflexions*, Mr. *Edward* doth either *know* or he doth *not*. If he *doth*, it is a wonder he will not *name* the right Author, but raile it out against *me*, for his having been *gibbetted* by *another*. If he doth *not*, it is a wonder he will *resolve* to raile at me at all *adventure*, without the patience to consider what will happen in the conclusion.

This hath happen'd to him already, that the *impiety* of his *Preface* confute's his *Book*. For after so palpable a *falsity*, upon which he *begins* with Mr. *Pierce*, what honest man will ever *heed* him in what he *add's* of Mr. *Busby*? Nay if his *passion* and his *Pet* can so transport him out of *Reason*, as to make him inveigh in great measure against I know not what *Calumnies*, *Incivilities*, and *Slanders*, committed against him by a person who never stood in his way, or beheld his face, or contributed in the least to his *ejection* out of the *School*, or ever printed any thing of him which he so sturdily pretends; what will he not say of his *Master Busby*, who accidentally hath *hurt* him, though he hath done him *no wrong*? Can he be carefull of the *Truth* whilst he is in his *Paroxysme*, who will not regard it in *cooler Blood*? When the *Boy in Horace* was found a *lyar*, truth it self became incredible whilst it proceeded out of his mouth.

I am a *stranger* to Mr. *Busby* as much as to *Grotius* in his Grave; and if Mr. *Busby* were in his Grave I would vindicate him further than now I shall. For though I think it a thing below me to *flatter* the greatest man *alive*, yet

yet I am freest from the *suspicion*, when I am liberal to the *Dead*. I should not otherwise have taken such *pains* for *Grotius*, but that I am sure he *cannot thank* me, and have also * *respect* to a greater *Recompense*. But I have *heard* of Mr. *Busby* as well as *Grotius*; and I cannot choose but *resent* what he hath suffered, so far forth as to rejoyce in whatsoever *aspersions* are cast upon me, by which Mr. *Busby* shines forth the *cleaner*. I have been told of the *depth* and great *variety* of his *Learning*, but that which gained him my reverence was the greater *Sanctity* of his *life*; the *effects* of which had been told me long before Mr. *Bagshaw* appeared against him. Some of his *well-natur'd* Scholars have long since been of my acquaintance; and knowing our *Teachers* are to be honoured next to our *Parents* and our *God*, I have esteemed them so much the more, the more they have given me the *pleasure* to hear them speak of his *goodness* and *gracious living*. Light and Darkness are not more opposite than Mr. *Busby* and Mr. *Busby*, as represented by Mr. *Bagshaw* and men of *worth*. The * *malecontent* Mr. *Bagshaw* hath drawn him out in strange colours, painting him *covetous*, and *cruel*, and *void of Conscience*, *violent*, *dissembling*, *corrupt*, *ambitious*, *tyrannical*, *oppressive*, and what he pleaseth; but all manner of persons of worth and quality (that I can hitherto meet with) are ready to censure this sawcy *Censor*, as one of the *sillyest* in the kind they ever heard of: He having written as precisely *against* the *evidences* of *Truth*, and the daily *experience* of all about him, as if he had thought it a fine thing to be found a *Railer*, and never more to be credited in what he utters. I still professe I am acquainted with nothing else of Mr. *Busby* besides his *Fame*, and from thence I can attestate, that for his *mastery* over his Passions, and his *diffusiveness* of his *substance* as well as of *himself*, (to all, at least who are *deserving* as well as *needy*) I have heard few persons commended more. And in relation to his *Scholars*, such I have heard hath been the *Wisdom*, the *Gravity*, and the *Obligingness* of his Carriage, that the ingenuous part of them had rather suffer his *Rod* than his *displeasure*.

* ἀνέβλεψε εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν. Heb. 11. 26.

* Narrat. p. 22. l. 3. from the bottom.

What

What I have heard of his †Fatherlike both *care* and *kindness* to his Disciples (I mean his care to instruct them in Rules and Principles of * *Living*, as well as in the Elements of *Human Learning*) hath made me *compare* him in my thoughts to *Homer's Phœnix*, whom *Plutarch* sets as an *Exemplar* for all *Educators* of *Youth*, Δεῖ δὲ τὸν παιδαγωγὸν τοιοῦτον εἶναι, ἵνα ὁ Φοῖνιξ ὁ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως παιδαγωγός. How much was due from Mr. *Bagshaw* to so deserving a *Master* (to whose *school* I know an * *Emperour* who would very gladly have sent his *son*, had *he* been living in *these* dayes, or had there been a Mr. *Busby* at least in *his*.) I wish Mr. *Bagshaw* had been instructed by what you have written to Mr. *Davis*, who was (it seems) your own *Master* at *Burford School*, and to whom you dedicate (with your self) your *Ecclesia Vindicata*, with all your seasonable labours therein conteined.

† πῶς ἂν ἔτι καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φίλου τέκνου —

* μυθῶν τε ῥητῆρ' ἔμεναι, πρηκτῆρά τε ἔργων. *Homer* Ἰλ. ι.

Plutarch περὶ τῆς ἐξ παιδ. ἀγωγ.

* Ἔτω μέτεστι Περσίναξ καὶ ἐστίμου ἦν, εἰς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀνεῖτο, ἤδη μεγάλιστον ὄντα, μήτε εἰς τὸν βασίλειον ἀυλὸν ἀναπαγῆναι, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πατρῴᾳ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ εἰς τὰ συνοῦσα πρόσοντα διδασκαλεῖα καὶ γυμνάσια, ἰδιωτεύοντα, ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς παιδεύεσθαι, &c. *Herodian. lib.* 2. *mihi p.* 37.

That Mr. *Busby* had been his *Master*, Mr. *Bagshaw* hath oftentimes confessed; that Mr. *Busby* had been *kind* and *friendly* to him, yea *zealous* and *earnest* for his preferment to the *Ushers* place in that School, Mr. *Bagshaw* also doth acknowledge in the *first pages* of his *Narrative*.

Tam bene apud memorem veteris stat Gratia falti.

Mr. *Busby's merit* and *discretion* Mr. *Bagshaw* doth not deny. That Mr. *Busby* was at the charge of *Repairing* and *Improveing* the publick *School*, and was careful that his Scholars might not lose the least benefit, which they might gain by his *Assistant* maintained also at his *expense*, Mr. *B.* himself hath well informed us; Why then doth Mr. *Bagshaw* lay such *loads* of *foul language* (exceedingly much *worse* then he layes on *me*) on so *obliging* a *Master*, and

Narrat. p. 4. p. 28. so *venerable* a *man*? Why must so excellent a person be charg'd with *Perjury*, & *Treachery*, and *violation of Conscience*, yea *with abuses of such a vile and unmanly nature*, that Mr. *Bagshaw* himself, *without blushing is not able to think of them*? Truly as far as I can guess by Mr. *Bagshaws* own *Narrative*, the Reason of it was chiefly this, Mr. *Busby* desired an *Assistant* without the favour and consent of his *Quondam Scholar*: nay he desired it of the *Governours*, although he had not first asked his *Scholar's pleasure*. The Governours knowing that the *Master* was growing apace into *years*, gave him the liberty of a *Crutch* at his own peculiar cost and charges, without so much as asking the *Usher's leave*; all was displeasing to Mr. *Bagshaw* the *under-Teacher* of the School. The affront was such as he could not bear, (and yet upon the *post-fact* he * *blesseth God* for having *endued him with patience in so extraordinary a measure.*) Hence his † *Rebellion* against his *Master*, and (by a consequence unavoidable) against the *Governors of the School*. Mr. *Busby* (the Master) makes a *Petition* to the Governors to defend their *Order* and his *Right* against the *Ushers Insurrections*; the *Articles* of the Petition the Usher partly *confesseth* and partly *mollifies*: but *all* not sufficing to free the *Usher from a suspension*, he after * falls upon the *Governors* for *resolving* to gratifie Mr. *Busby by a removal of Mr.* Bagshaw, (right or wrong) notwithstanding the *conviction* which Mr. *Bagshaws speech* had wrought upon them. And though he saith they were † *many and honourable persons* who stood *in favour of Mr.* Busby, yet they * *concluded on the removal* of (so *innocent* an *Usher* as) Mr. *Bagshaw*, even *before it could be resolved* (saith the *Usher himself*) *upon what ground to bottom such a proceeding.*" And so we see his main charge doth wholly lye against the Governors, whose *proceeding* and *sentence* was their own proper act, although *in favour* of Mr. *Busby*, whose *fault* it was *not* if he was *favour'd*, much less was it the Governors to do him *right*.

* Ibid.

† p. 14, 15.

* p. 23. at the bottom.

† p. 24.

* Ibid. l. 4, 5, 6.

† p. 22, 23. Mr. *Bagshaw* † professeth his great *unwillingness to give his Enemies the pleasure of seeing him troubled*. And yet he pro-

professeth that * *no man is more inwardly discontented.* He also told the very *Governours,* * *he had not yet so much as modestly complained,* as if his *complaints* before going were too *immodest* to be *denyed.* He hath printed his *Commendadation* from *three of the* † *nearest of his Acquaintance* affirming his *abilities to be great and unquestionable in point of Learning,* and *his life, to their knowledge, is very Godly.* What his *abilities* are for *Learning,* I will not by any means determin, nor will I speak to his *prejudice* in any kind without ground. But had he vindicated his Sermons from *Tilenus* his *Reflections,* I suppose *Tilenus* would have appeared in vindication of the Text and his own Reflections. As for his *life and Conversation,* I am fittest to judge of *that* as far as the guilt of his *Preface* comes to. And Mr. *Busby* can best measure him by the Enormities of his *Book.*

* *p.* 22. *at the bottom.*
* *p.* 19.
† *p.* 2.

Whereas he saith of Mr. *Calvin,* and three more of his *Followers departing from him,* (as he doth often from *himself*) *that they lie under the same contempt and obloquy*; I must needs affirm, he is prodigiously mistaken. For never were they taxt of shewing *ingratitude* to their *Masters*; nor were their *persons* ever *contemn'd,* in that their *Arguments* were *confuted.* If so, I am sure they were much *contemn'd by one another.* To say that Mr. *Calvin* ascribeth *Sin* to Gods *impulse,* and that Dr. *Twisse* defendeth *Zuinglius,* affirming God to be the *Author of Adultery and Murder,* and to cite their *pages* wherein their words are to be seen, is to discover their *Doctrines*, and no farther to meddle with the *men.* When the most learned Mr. *Hales,* (even whilst he was a *Calvinist,* not yet converted by † *Episcopius,*) told in one of his *Letters to Sir Dudley Carleton,* how *Gomarus* pleaded for this position, * *that God did predestine men to Sin,* we cannot say that Mr. *Hales* did load that Synodist with *obloquy,* by relating the story with his *dislike,* and saying *he mended the Question, as Tinkers mend Kettles; making it worse then it was before.*

† See Mr. *Farindon's* Accompt prefixt to *Hales his Remains.*
* See Mr. Hales *his Letter of Decemb.* 12. 1618. *p.* 47.

But what can be possibly so absurd, which Mr. *Bagshaw*

will not dare to put in *print* when he is *Angry*? He sayes *I seem to be enamour'd upon my numerous issue*, when yet his very *Calumny* implies his *self-Contradiction*. For he concludes me the *Father* of the severall *Reflections on his Discourse*, although he *knows* I never *own'd* them. And could he think it my *Issue*, upon which I was *enamour'd* but would not *own*? Had I indeed been the *Author* of *all* those *Bookes*, of which by enemies and friends I have been *suspected*, Mr. *Bagshaw* might have call'd it a *numerous issue*. And of *some* of those many he might suppose me to be *enamour'd*, could I have had but the *madnesse* to think them *mine*. I have disowned so many Bookes, (since *Oxford* was *visited* with the *Plague*) not because I conceiv'd them *unworthy* of me, but because I would not be *overvalued*, nor offend like the old, or the new *Bathyllus*. Perhaps indeed I am the Author of as many things which shall be *namelesse*, as those to which I have put my *name*. But does it follow I am the Author of those *Reflections*, for which Mr. *Bagshaw* hath *rail'd* against me, as if I had really been one of his *Quondam-Masters*? I *deny* that *sequel*; and let him *prove* it if he is able. Or can I seem to be *enamour'd of a numerous issue*, who would not be thought to be the *parent* of as *many* as I *may*, but of as *few*, as I think I must?

But I am probably to be blam'd, for taking notice (so much at *large*) of so lewd a writer. Whose inhumanity towards *me*, without the least *shadow* or *shew* of reason, (I having never provok'd him in *any kind*, unlesse it were by my peaceable and passive silence) as it hath *antidoted* the *venome* which he hath spit at Mr. *Busby*; so to be *hated* by such a person, *with* such a person as Mr. *Busby*, will (I doubt not) procure me his Readers *Love*.

Having now done with Mr. *Bagshaw*, I bid him heartily *Farewell*. Nor do I say it as a complement, or *word of Course*, but as wishing him *Repentance* and *change* of *Life*. Of the *other Oxonian* I take *no leave*, as having given him no more then a *Salutation*, and as supposing he may deserve a more elaborate *entertainment*. If Sir I have *tyr'd*

you

you with too much *length*, I will not detain you any longer, than whilst I may humbly desire your *pardon*, and very heartily commend you to the special guidance of the *Almighty*, in whom I am and shall be ever,

Brington. *July*. 7. 1659.

Your sincerely affectionate and humble Servant,

THOMAS PIERCE.

THE END.

ERRATA.

PAge 3. l. 36. for *or* r. *nor* p. 12. l. 8. r. *France* p. 19. l. 29. after *all* r. *of* p. 21. l. 32. for *Mr.* r. *Dr.* p. 28. l. 28. for *concluding* r. *unconcluding* p. 37. in marg. l. 5. for *missarum* r. *amissarum* p. 41. l. 7. r. *brains* p. 42. l. 11. r. *conceit* p. 49. l. 34. for *leasure* r. *pleasure* p. 56. l. 26. for *was* r. *twas* p. 57. l. 16. after *agree* r. *not* p. 93. l. 32. dele *to* p. 100. in marg. l. 5. r. p. 40. 41. 42. p. 108. l. 16. r. Dr. *John Still* p. 111. l. 8. r. *real* p. 117. in marg. l. 7 after *Rusticano* r. p. 209. *Hieronovia Edit. A. D.* 1611. p. 120. l. 16. after *were* r. *both* p. 147. in marg. l. 6. for p. 123. r. 122. p. 170. l. 20. for *do* r. *not* p. 217. l. 21. after *Tom* begin the *Thirty first Section* p. 219. l. 29. for *and* r. *not* p. 221. l. 15. for *not* r. *not* p. 222. l. 17. for *very* r. *every* p. 228. l. 7. r. *pullitici*.

Books

Books Printed for, and sold by Richard Royston.

Books written by Dr. *Hammond.*

A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New-Testament by *H. Hammond*, D. D. in *fol.* the second Edition enlarged.

2. The *Practical Catechism*, with other English Treatises, in two volumes in 4.

3. *Dissertationes quatuor quibus Episcopatus Jura ex S. Scripturis & Primæva Antiquitate adstruuntur, contra sententiam* D. Blondelli *& aliorum, in* 4.

4. A Letter of Resolution of six Queries in 12.

5. Of Schism. A defence of the Church of *England* against the exceptions of the Romanists, in 12.

6. Of Fundamentals in a notion referring to practice, in 12.

7. *Parænesis*, or a seasonable exhortation to all true sons of the Church of *England*, in 12.

8. A Collection of several Replies & Vindications published of late, most of them in defence of the Church of *England*, now put together in four Volumes. Newly published, in 4.

9. The Dispatcher Dispatch'd, in Answer to a late Roman Catholick Book, intituled *Schism Dispatch'd* in 4. new.

10. A Review of the Paraphrase and Annotations on all the Books of the *New-Testament*, with some additions and alterations, in 8.

11. Some profitable directions both for Priest and people, in two Sermons 8. new.

Books and Sermons written by J. Taylor D. D.

ENιαυτὸς, A Course of Sermons for all the Sundays of the year; together with a discourse of the Divine Institution, Necessity, Sacredness and Separation of the Office Ministerial, in *fol.*

2. The history of the Life and Death of the Ever-blessed Jesus Christ, third Edition in *fol.*

3. The Rule and Exercises of holy living, in 12.

4. The Rule and Exercises of holy dying, in 12.

5. The Golden Grove, or, A Manuall of daily Prayers, fitted to the daies of the week, together with a short Method of Peace and Holiness, in 12.

6. The Doctrine and Practice of Repentance rescued from popular Errors, in a large 8. newly published.

7. A Collection of Polemical and Moral discourses, in *fol.*

8. A Discourse of the Nature, Offices and Measure of Friendship, in 12. new.

9. A Collection of Offices or forms of prayer fitted to the needs of all Christians, together with the Psalter or Psalms of *David* after the Kings Translations, in a large octavo newly published.

10. *Ductor Dubitantium*, or Cases of Conscience, *fol.* Now in the Press.

Books written by Mr. Tho. Pierce *Rector of* Brington.

1. THe *Sinner impleaded* in his own *Court*, wherein are represented the great discouragements from sinning, which the Sinner receiveth from Sin it self, in 12. new printed.

2. The Badge and Cognizance of Christs Disciples, preached at S. *Pauls* Church before the Gentlemen of *Wiltshire*, 4.

3. The Christians Rescue from the grand error of the heathen, touching the fatal necessity of all events, in 5. Books in 4. new.

The new Discoverer Discover'd by way of Answer to Mr. *Baxter*, with a rejoynder to his Key for Catholicks and Disputations about Church-Government.

Ῥωμαϊκὴ Αἱρεσις Ὀξεῖα, or the Church of *England* defended, in two Treatises against the Fabulous and Scandalous imputations cast upon her in those two Points. Of Succession of Bishops and Schism, wherein the fable of the Nags-head-Ordination is detected, and the accusation of Schism retorted By *John Bramhall* D. D. Bishop of *Derry*.

The Law of Laws or the excellency of the *Civil Law* above all other humane Laws whatsoever: shewing of how great use and necessity the Civil Law is to this Nation. By *Robert Wisemin*. Dr. of the Civil Law. 4. new.

The Grand conspiracy, by Master *J. Allington*, in 12.

The History of the Church of Scotland by Dr. *Spotswood* Archbishop of S. *Andrews*, in *fol.*

Etymologicum parvum, in 8. by Mr. *Gregory* School-master of Westminster.

The contemplation of heaven, in a descant on the prayer in the garden, in 12.

The Magistrates Authority, a Sermon by Master *Lyford*, in 4.

The Quakers wild questions objected against the Ministers of the Gospel, by Master *R. Sherlock*, in 4.

The Communicants Guide, by Master *Grove*, in 8.

The plain mans sense exercised, by Master *William Lyford*, in 4.

Anglicismus Latiniz'd by Mr. *Willis*, in 8.

The persecuted Minister, written by Mr. *Lingly*, Minister of the Gospel, 4.

Lyfords Legacy in 12.

The Catechism of the Church of *England* paraphrased, by *Richard Sherlock*. 3. Edition.

An Apology for the Ministry by *William Lyford*.

The Examination of *Tilenus*, before the Triers in *Utopia*, in 12. newly published.

The Calvinists Cabinet, unlocked, in answer to Mr. *Baxter*, by *Tilenus* Junior. New in 12.

Examen Historicum, or a discovery and Examination of the mistakes, falsities and defects in some modern Histories, 8. by *P. Heylin* D. D. New.

Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ, The works of that Great Monarch and Glorious Martyr King *Charls* the first, both Sacred and Civil, together with a short view of his Life and Reign.

Certain Considerations of present Concernment, touching this Reformed Church of *England* by *H. Ferne*. D. D. in 12.

A Compendious Discourse upon the Case, by *Henry Ferne*, in 12.

Ἰαχὴ Ἀδακρυα. *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Suspiria*. The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of *England*: set

setting forth her former Constitution, compared with her present condition; also, the visible Causes, and probable Cures of her Distempers, in four Books, newly extant in *fol.* By *John Gauden*, D.D. of *Bocking* in *Essex*.

Certamen Religiosum, or a Conference betwixt the late King *Charles* and the late Lord Marques of *Worcester* concerning Religion.

Royalists defence printed at *Oxon.* 4.

Mercurius Rusticus or the Countrymans complaint against Lieutenant Generall *Cromwells* plundering, and defacing Cathedrals printed at *Oxf.* 8.

The Regall apology printed at *Oxon.*

Bishop *Bramhalls* faite warning to take heed of the Scotch Discipline. 4.

Sacro-sancta Regum Majestas, written by the Archbishop of *Tuam*.

Doctor *Stuards* Answer to *Fountains* Letter.

Episcopacy and *Presbytery* Considered by *Henry Ferne*, D.D.

A Sermon before his Majesty at the Isle of *Wight* by *Henry Ferne*, D. D.

Judicium Universitatis Oxoniensis de Solenni lege & fœdere, Juramento Negativo, &c.

Fifty Sermons preached by the Learned and Reverend *John Donne*, D.D.

Doctor *Cozens* Devotions, &c.

The End of the Catalogue.
